

FINAL REPORT

IMPACTS, BEST PRACTICES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM NINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS
USAID/POLAND
(1992-98)

November 1998

Prepared for

U.S. Agency for International Development

By

Nancy K. Diamond, Ph.D., Team Leader
Regina Ostergaard-Klem, Ph.D., Environment Advisor
Stanislaw Sitnicki, Ph.D., Senior Advisor
Daniel Hall, Associate Advisor

INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
Municipal Development and Management Program
USAID Contract No. PCE-C-00-95-00001-00
Request for Services #169

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK	1
2	ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	3
3	USAID/POLAND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, 1992-1998	5
4	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM IMPACTS, BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
4.1	National Policy	6
4.2	Gmina Environmental Management	11
4.3	Service Providers	19
4.4	Financial Institutions and Investors	27
5	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	31

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Impact Assessment Scope of Work
- B. Schedule
- C. Contact List
- D. References
- E. Methodology
- F. Training Analysis
- G. Acronym List

ABSTRACT

With an eye to mission closeout and a strong interest in supporting their current flagship project for local governments, USAID/Poland's Warsaw mission and Regional Urban Development Office (RUDO) commissioned this program impact assessment for nine environmental projects that were implemented from 1992 to 1998. All of the funding for the environmental activities came from the 1990 Seed Act (or as amended). Approximately 27 million dollars were spent on these nine activities from 1992-98.

The assessment was performed by the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) under USAID Contract No. PCE-C-00-95-00001-00, Request for Services #169. The ICMA assessment team obtained information through a review of relevant literature and open-ended interviews with diverse informants from assisted and unassisted institutions in South-western Poland (Warsaw, Krakow, Katowice, Opole, Brzeg, Ziebice, Wroclaw, Gliwice, Lodz and Radom).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

With an eye to mission closeout and a strong interest in supporting their current flagship project for local governments, USAID/Poland's Warsaw mission and Regional Urban Development Office (RUDO) commissioned this program impact assessment for nine environmental projects that were implemented from 1992 to 1998. USAID was interested in going beyond individual project evaluations to seek information on broader impacts and best practices. The mission wanted to better understand: 1) how their environmental projects have contributed to changes in policies and institutional practices by gminas (municipalities), service providers, financial institutions and investors, and 2) which “best practices” could assist the current Local Government Partnership Project (LGPP) in its efforts to achieve widespread impact from technical assistance and training activities. Although these environmental projects were designed with environmental objectives in mind, it was hoped that some of their experience would be relevant to the mission's current strategic focus on better gmina management.

The nine environmental projects included in this assessment are listed in Table 1. Seven of the projects focused on local environmental issues; one focused on national policy and another worked on brokering joint ventures between U.S. environmental technology firms and their Polish counterparts. One large project, coordinated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), is actually a compilation of nine separate activities. Overall, the projects offered different combinations of technical assistance, training, small grants, and information dissemination. They worked with a wide range of partners (e.g., municipal authorities, environmental NGOs, consulting firms, environmental experts in the academic and consulting communities, factory managers and industry representatives, voivodship (regional) environmental funds and financial sector representatives). Although many of these projects performed well, most have been closed in the last two years due to redefined mission objectives.

All of the funding for the environmental activities came from the 1990 Seed Act (or as amended). Approximately 27 million dollars were spent on these nine activities from 1992-98. The mission also spent 46 million dollars on other environmental activities: an Inter-Agency Agreement with the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) for the Krakow Low Emissions and Skawina Projects (30 million dollars combined) and energy efficiency activities (approximately 16 million dollars). However, these projects are not included in this assessment because they were significantly different from the other nine projects. They were heavily reliant on large capital grants and technical assistance was integrated into the use of capital funds. For example, 14 of the 20 million dollars spent on the Krakow Low Emissions Project went to capital grants.

The assessment team obtained information through a review of relevant literature and open-ended interviews with diverse informants from assisted and unassisted institutions in

Southwestern Poland (Warsaw, Krakow, Katowice, Opole, Brzeg, Ziebice, Wroclaw, Gliwice, Lodz and Radom).

Summary and Conclusions

The USAID/Warsaw environmental projects used a variety of approaches to environmental management, policymaking and finance over its first six years. By using available regional and global environmental projects, as well as Inter-Agency agreements and other types of project modalities, the Poland mission learned about which activities appear to work best under certain conditions in Poland. While there were both overlaps and some outlying projects, USAID assistance did achieve positive impacts and some replication. We found gminas, Voivodship Environmental Funds and service providers (both for-profit and NGO service providers) practicing and institutionalizing new skills in modern management, strategic planning, fundraising, proposal packaging and marketing. Our findings suggest that the most significant impacts of these programs appear to be related to the institutional strengthening of service providers, the expanded use of service providers by gminas, better environmental management by individual gminas and more transparent and efficient procedures for assisted environmental funds.

For service providers assisted by USAID, the team found significant and positive USAID impacts upon their practices for both internal management and client services. USAID assistance enabled interested project offices to establish independent commercial enterprises or non-profit centers. With assisted for-profit consulting firms, both pre-existing and new firms, USAID support resulted in a serious boost to their sustainability by improving their skills, expanding their services and staff and adapting a full-service approach for clients. For NGO service providers, it is still unclear as to whether or not they will be sustainable in the long-term because of their legal restrictions, weakness in their business skills, constrained finances and the image problems related to being NGOs. Accordingly, future support to service providers should focus on improving the business skills of NGO service providers related to fundraising, identifying and meeting market demand. Assistance is also needed to help both types of service providers to diversify the services that they provide and offer a full-service, client-first orientation. Although there has been no past support for the formation of professional associations for environmental consultants and trainers, it would assist service providers in the other weak areas: professional development/continuing education, certification, legislative tracking and advocacy.

With respect to training, USAID assistance has helped service providers to learn how to make training most relevant to their gmina clients and maximize horizontal linkages. The following training features are effective with gminas: participation of both gmina leaders and technical staff, certification provided by an outside internationally recognized institution, use of Polish case studies and interactive training methodologies, using trained participants as future trainers, course scheduling on Friday and Saturday and in the first half of the year to avoid budget shortfalls. There were other areas of difficulty and we recommend the following: training could be more affordable for public sector representatives if public and private sector participants are mixed and a sliding scale is used for public participants; new horizontal

linkages among training participants could be cemented with follow-on technical assistance, alumni networks and twinning arrangements among gminas; concepts and methods related to two-way public participation could be incorporated into a wide array of trainings and technical assistance for gminas and poviats. To improve the overall quality of training, greater efforts should be made in the future to require greater sharing, replication and dissemination of training curricula.

From the perspective of service provider clients, both industrial and gmina clients now have more positive attitudes about the capabilities of service providers over the last six years. These markets are expanding as a result of more requests for follow-up services and training. Business has been generated through educational efforts by service providers about demonstrated cost savings, use of small initial engagements with follow-up requests and combining services in strategic planning with the actual implementation of the strategic plan. To further expand their market for gmina training and ensure that gmina budgets provide for professional development, service providers should devote further attention to educating gmina council members on the value of staff education. Whenever possible, NGO service providers should continue to cultivate links with gmina associations since they have been able to provide membership and business contacts, case studies and trainers. To better track the future impact of USAID assistance on service providers, it would be helpful to conduct a pre- and post-market survey of the demand for, and supply of services.

With regard to USAID-support publications, some projects succeeded in institutionalizing USAID-supported publications while others failed. Publications were institutionalized when they addressed market demand; were developed, published, updated and disseminated in partnership with a permanent Polish institution; and/or USAID project offices continued as independent entities and found other source of funding for publications. Although they were unable to become institutionalized, two worthy publications merit updating and further distribution: the C4EP/EAPS guidebook on environmental financing and the Cooperation Fund's guidebooks on solid waste management. With regard to housing, disseminating and updating public information (including training modules), success has been mixed with using for-profit consulting firms and universities for these purposes. In the future, it would be advisable to use professional associations or unions for this information.

For assisted gminas, many more staff have been trained in environmental issues and management. Staff from USAID-assisted gminas are now applying their new skills from one type of environmental project to other environmental projects and also applying these skills to other sectors of gmina management. They are improving their success rate at packaging successful proposals for external funds. Technical assistance to gminas has resulted in financial savings from improved technical review of proposals and better procurement procedures for vendor/consultant proposals. The most positive results have come from a combination of training and technical assistance; results from training appear more dependent on leadership and development of critical mass.

For assisted gminas, USAID projects have helped forge new horizontal linkages among gmina staff and between gmina staff and the broader community. USAID training in

participatory planning tools (e.g., Local Environmental Action Plans, Environmental Impact Assessments) and activities have succeeded in changing the attitudes of some municipal officials toward the value of broader participation in environmental decision-making. Although support to environmental NGOs was minimal, their environmental education/communication activities appear to have had some positive impacts on municipal-civic relations (e.g., REEC's Blue Thumb water programs with school clubs and other water stakeholders) and helped strengthen gmina environmental management. To further build local linkages for critical mass, it would be advisable to have gmina staff and NGO representatives from the same community attend training courses together on topics such as participatory planning tools.

For assisted financial institutions, USAID had a positive impact on the efficiency and transparency of a number of VEFs and to a lesser extent, the National Environmental Fund. To some extent, these new procedures have reduced political pressures for favoritism. The funds of the assisted VEFs are being used more efficiently and achieving environmental objectives in Krakow and Katowice. When environmental funds cofunded and collaborated on the development of software and procedures, this early "buy-in" ensured adoption, use and replication of these tools. In contrast, tools developed without cofinancing and early cooperation were only used by a few environmental funds. This model of early buy-in should be replicated for tools developed for gminas and other institutions.

The impacts of clearer and more rigorous fund procedures include improved proposal quality from gminas and others and more business for service providers in proposal packaging. As a result of effective proposal packaging with USAID support, gminas and other leveraged millions of dollars of environmental funding. These skills have enabled gminas to diversify their funding sources for environmental projects. USAID should consider providing training in this area to more gminas.

For policy, the team found quite limited impacts on national environmental policy and little was done to broaden the national policy-making process. Although not an intended impact, the national policy activities did positively impact Poland's next generation of environmental economists and policy advisors by working with university consultants and providing new opportunities and ideas. The limited policy impacts can be explained, in part, by the low level of USAID environmental investments in national policy activities and institutions (1.5 million spent on one project over 28 months). National policy tends to be a long-term investment with potential for very significant payoff *once policies are passed*. It appears that some of the national policy "seeds" (ideas, tools, mechanisms) planted by advisors were planted too soon to be useful at the time, some fell on infertile soil and some are only now sprouting—several years after their planting. Some difficulties have resulted from frequent shifts in policy-makers and ministry staff during the last six years. While the upcoming EU accession activities may speed up national policy reforms originally initiated by USAID activities, policy implementation at the local level is likely to be delayed at the local level due to impending administrative reform of January 1, 1999. Both events are likely to require further technical assistance and training for gmina and powiat staff to help them understand legal changes.

A few other projects worked on local environmental activities which were indirectly related to national policy reformation in several areas (i.e., public procurement, environmental impact assessment, air monitoring) but these national policy impacts appeared to be fortuitous rather than strategically planned outcomes of USAID assistance.

At the national level, the greatest USAID policy impacts appeared to be catalyzed by: 1) activities that fostered either expert dialogue or direct dialogue between policymakers and environmental managers or local officials, and 2) focused on issues that were tied to EU accession. It is still unclear to many policymakers and managers as to how Poland with harmonize its regulations with EU requirements in an expedient manner. It would be advisable for USAID to encourage policy dialogue, via roundtables or conferences, on issues which directly support good environmental management at the gmina level (e.g., a single or serial set of meetings on the implications of EU accession on financing of environmental infrastructure development and environmental management at by gminas and powiats). Another important means of achieving policy dialogue would be through training. USAID experience indicates that training provided many local participants with a rare opportunity to have an open policy dialogue with other participants from different institutions and environment policymakers and this should be an explicit goal of much-needed future trainings on standards and requirements for local environmental infrastructure.

If more regional funds become available, USAID should consider support for a more open policymaking process via assistance to under-funded environmental groups, such as policy NGOs or environmental professional associations, who are already active in lobbying and promoting dialogue and cooperation among environmental stakeholders.

In terms of replication, the results were mixed. In general, we observed that the incentives for replication included mechanisms for on-going dialogue and shared experiences (e.g., training, Local Environmental Action Plans), shared interests or concerns (e.g., solid waste management, protection of drinking water, air quality, legislative changes, EU legal reforms), shared tools (e.g., Voivodship Environmental Funds software) and shared tasks (e.g., regional economic development).

For replication among gminas, we focused on assisted communities due to time. We did note quite a bit of inter-gmina learning and replication among assisted gmina groups. USAID succeeded when it systematically sought to achieve replication by working with new or existing groups of gminas. Replication among gminas appears to be facilitated by project activities which allow gmina representatives to meet regularly and foster linkages over time; good ideas were then adopted because they no longer are associated with a particular individual or political party. By using a single service provider for a group of gminas and mixing gminas in training, the shared service-provider acted as a conduit for information across gminas and encouraged communication and replication. By working with gminas already interested in forming a gmina union or gmina associations, either member-run or professionally staffed, USAID was able to benefit from a relatively stable entity with institutional memory that transcended election-related changes. Although more study is needed to determine the extent and mechanisms of replication within gmina associations, they seem to

be a good option for fast-track replication. The LEAP experience suggests that replication is promoted by sequenced pilot activities, use of citizen consultants from earlier pilots and early twinning of demonstrator and potential replicator gminas. Replication was also promoted by establishing a public information center at an already-known and frequently visited demonstration site for solid waste management (Zywiec). Replication seemed less reliable when expensive demonstration activities were set up in single communities with the exception of adaptation by Katowice and the National Government of Krakow's air monitoring system. While gmina-gmina replication within Poland is of greatest interest, there were also examples of Polish-Czech and Polish-U.S. replication and cooperation as a result of on-going sister city relationships and a transboundary project.

Because USAID is concerned with widespread replication between assisted and unassisted communities, it would be advisable to collect baseline information and monitor changes in both types of communities and systematically track efforts by unassisted communities to seek information or replicate new USAID-promoted activities. Furthermore, it would be quite valuable to train gminas and/or poviats about how to teach others about their positive experiences.

Among service providers, both for-profits and NGOs, the incentives were weak for cooperation, learning or replication. For the most part, there are few professional associations or other fora to support this kind of dialogue.

Among the Environmental Funds, collaboration and replication were promoted by multi-fund "buy-in" on tools and shared concerns. Health concerns provided an important basis for collaboration, cofunding and replication among environmental funds, gminas and stakeholders within gminas. These concerns included protecting drinking water sources by Wroclaw, reducing smog in Krakow and gmina-funded student water monitoring in Ziebice. USAID should supported further dialogue on how to diversify sources of funding for gmina environmental infrastructure using health and river basin incentives.

For the nine programs that we assessed, the team did not note any negative impacts *per se*, only programmatic weaknesses and gaps. The weakest areas of the environmental program include several areas. As an oversight in project design and as a result of having disconnected separate projects, the national policy work was mostly decoupled from the day-to-day concerns of gminas related to local environmental management. Most of the projects did not strengthen linkages between actors at the national and gmina level and between gminas and financial institutions. NGO service providers are still fairly weak with respect to financial sustainability and business-related skills. Some good publications were not institutionalized and public information centers were not as effective as possible. At the gmina and national level, environmental NGOs could have used more funds to create more pressure for better gmina environmental management and civic participation. For gminas, it will be important to build a critical mass of trained staff and elected officials to cement institutional changes, despite election outcomes. It is also important that they do not continue to confuse public information with public participation. Brokering services for Polish-American joint ventures in environmental technology were largely unsuccessful.

However, if one looks across the actors and institutions described above, it is quite obvious that the USAID environmental program made a very significant and important impact on the development of horizontal linkages among people and institutions who never shared information or resources in the past. Almost all of our informants noted these much-appreciated linkages and opportunities to overcome the legacy of secrecy and centralization that characterized the former Communist government. In contrast to the early 1990s, there are many more horizontal relationships, in which information, resources and decision-making are decentralized within institutions, and shared across institutions and with the public. Training, shared technical assistance, small grants, participatory planning, shared tasks and concerns catalyzed broad-based civic and financial support for local environmental problems.

Many kinds of diverse horizontal linkages have been and continue to be forming at the local and regional levels. These linkages partnerships, networks and associations between gminas and also among gminas and NGOs, citizens, utilities, VEFs, etc. Further work is still needed to change government attitudes about the value of genuine civic participation, teach practical methods for encouraging local and national participation and improve local government-NGO relations. For the foreseeable future, support will be needed in Poland to continue building skills and strengthening horizontal linkages among environmental stakeholders.

In sum, USAID's early and on-going support to improving skills, changing attitudes and creating many more horizontal linkages came at an important time in Poland and has helped to build the critical mass needed for better environmental management.

Table 1. Environmental Projects Reviewed for Program Impact Assessment

Project Name	Partners	Activities	Dates of Operation	Funding Levels
Local Environmental Management (LEM) I & II	LEM, S.C. Research Triangle Institute	Regional Cooperative Agreement to provide technical assistance and training on financing, construction or modernization of wastewater treatment plants & sanitary landfill projects	LEM I: 7/92-9/95 LEM II: 9/95-7/98	\$3.3 million total
Industrial Pollution Prevention Project/ (WEC)	ATMOTERM Lodz Tech. Univ. Katowice Tech. Univ. World Env. Center, USA	Regional grant to create and support three Pollution Prevention Centers that introduced waste minimization technologies to Polish industry from 1994 onwards	1992-3/99	Approx. \$5.5 million
Environmental Training Project (ETP)	ETP Foundation Univ. of Minnesota, USA	Regional Cooperative Agreement for two types of one-year post-diploma certificate courses (industry & local government) and short-term training	1992-6/99	\$3.1 million

Project Name	Partners	Activities	Dates of Operation	Funding Levels
Environmental Action Program Support (EAPS)	Polish subcontractors Dynamika <i>et al.</i> Chemonics, Intl.	Regional contract to work with municipal officials to package projects for funders using "least-cost" methodologies. Technical assistance to Voivodship Environmental Funds for new procedures & software.	4/95-3/98	\$2.1 million
United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	EMTC; ISD; REEC, <i>et al.</i> USEPA & sub-contractors	Inter-Agency Agreement for nine projects: Krakow Air & Water, Krakow Urban Air, Environmental Management & Training Center (EMTC), Biosolids Management, Local Environmental Action Plans (LEAP), Polish Environmental Education Project, Emergency Response/Hazardous Waste, Environmental Compliance & Enforcement Underground Storage Tanks	1990-6/00 (some activities are on-going)	Approx. \$10 million
Environmental Health Project (EHP)	Camp, Dresser, Mckee	Buy-in to a global contract to develop an environmental health curriculum at the Institute of Public Health at Jagiellonian University	9/95-12/96	\$385,000
Capital Development Initiative/ Environment (CDI-E)	Sanders, Intl.	Regional grant to support brokering of joint ventures between U.S. environmental firms and Polish partners.	5/92-1/95	\$2.3 million
Urban Management Support Project (UMSP)	Cooperation Fund	Cooperative Agreement to increase capacity of consulting firms and NGOs to manage solid waste	9/95- 7/98	\$300,000
Central & Eastern Europe Environmental Economics & Policy Project (C4EP)	Univ.of Warsaw & Krakow consultants HIID, USA	Regional Cooperative Agreement that focused on national environmental policy development.	4/95-9/97	\$1.5 million

IMPACTS, BEST PRACTICES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM NINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS USAID/POLAND (1992-98)

1 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF WORK

With an eye to mission closeout and a strong interest in supporting their current flagship project for local governments, the Warsaw mission commissioned this program impact assessment for nine environmental projects that were implemented from 1992 to 1998. There were two objectives for this assessment. The first objective was to better understand USAID's impact on how Polish institutions and local governments are now addressing environmental issues in comparison to the situation prior to 1992. Did USAID's environmental programs contributed directly to changes in: national policy, gmina environmental management practices, NGOs and for-profit consulting firm practices, and financial institutions and investor practices? The mission wanted to identify concrete examples of how a USAID activity influenced attitudes and behavior at both the national and gmina levels and within the private sector. The second objective of this assessment was to produce a set of recommendations for integrating successful and relevant components of previous environmental activities into the Local Government Partnership Program (LGPP). Both the mission and the ENI Bureau also viewed this assessment as an opportunity for regional learning by other USAID ENI countries. (See Attachment A for the full Scope of Work)

Although many of these environmental projects were designed with environmental objectives in mind, USAID/Warsaw hoped that selected "best practices" from these nine projects (Table 1) would provide insight into how to maximize the impact of technical assistance and training activities. Seven of the projects focused on local environmental issues; one focused on national policy and another worked on brokering commercial joint ventures between U.S. environmental technology firms and their Polish counterparts. The nine separate sets of activities of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) are diverse and included in this assessment. These projects offered different combinations of technical assistance, training, small grants and information dissemination and worked with a wide range of partners (e.g., municipal authorities, environmental NGOs, consulting firms, environmental experts in the academic and consulting communities, factory managers and industry representatives, Voivodship Environmental Funds and financial sector representatives). Seven of the nine environmental projects were regional projects of USAID's Bureau for Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States (ENI); the Environmental Health Project, was a buy-in from a global contract from USAID/Washington's Global Bureau, Center for Population/Health/Nutrition (G/PHN) and the Urban Management Support Project was designed by the USAID/Warsaw mission.

All of the funding for environmental activities came from the 1990 SEED Act (or as amended). Approximately 27 million dollars was spent from 1992 to 1998 on the nine environmental activities described above. The mission also spent 46 million dollars on several other environmental activities: an Inter-Agency agreement with the U.S. Department of

Energy (USDOE) for the Krakow Low Emissions and Skawina Projects (30 million dollars combined) and energy efficiency activities (approximately 16 million dollars). However, these projects are not included in this assessment because they were significantly different from the other nine environmental projects. They were heavily reliant on large capital grants and technical assistance was integrated into the use of capital funds. For example, fourteen of the twenty million dollars spent on the Krakow Low Emissions Project¹ was spent on capital grants.

Table 1. Environmental Projects Reviewed for Program Impact Assessment

Project Name	Partners	Activities	Dates of Operation	Funding Levels
Local Environmental Management (LEM) I & II	LEM, S.C. Research Triangle Institute	Regional Cooperative Agreement to provide technical assistance and training on financing, construction or modernization of wastewater treatment plants & sanitary landfill projects	LEM I: 7/92-9/95 LEM II: 9/95-7/98	\$3.3 million total
Industrial Pollution Prevention Project/ (WEC)	ATMOTERM Lodz Tech. Univ. Katowice Tech. Univ. World Env. Center, USA	Regional grant to create and support three Pollution Prevention Centers that introduced waste minimization technologies to Polish industry from 1994 onwards	1992-3/99	Approx. \$5.5 million
Environmental Training Project (ETP)	ETP Foundation Univ. of Minnesota, USA	Regional Cooperative Agreement for two types of one-year post-diploma certificate courses (industry & local government) and short-term training	1992-6/99	\$3.1 million
Environmental Action Program Support (EAPS)	Polish subcontractors Dynamika <i>et al.</i> Chemonics, Intl.	Regional contract to work with municipal officials to package projects for funders using "least-cost" methodologies. Technical assistance to Voivodship Environmental Funds for new procedures & software.	4/95-3/98	\$2.1 million
United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	EMTC; ISD; REEC, <i>et al.</i> USEPA & sub-contractors	Inter-Agency Agreement for nine projects: Krakow Air & Water, Krakow Urban Air, Environmental Management & Training Center (EMTC), Biosolids Management, Local Environmental Action Plans (LEAP), Polish Environmental Education Project, Emergency Response/Hazardous Waste, Environmental Compliance & Enforcement Underground Storage Tanks	1990-6/00 (some activities are on-going)	Approx. \$10 million

¹The reader is referred to the 1996 evaluation of the Krakow Low Emissions Project for further information on these activities. This activity is funded until September 1999.

Project Name	Partners	Activities	Dates of Operation	Funding Levels
Environmental Health Project (EHP)	Camp, Dresser, Mckee	Buy-in to a global contract to develop an environmental health curriculum at the Institute of Public Health at Jagiellonian University	9/95-12/96	\$385,000
Capital Development Initiative/ Environment (CDI-E)	Sanders, Intl.	Regional grant to support brokering of joint ventures between U.S. environmental firms and Polish partners.	5/92-1/95	\$2.3 million
Urban Management Support Project (UMSP)	Cooperation Fund	Cooperative Agreement to increase capacity of consulting firms and NGOs to manage solid waste	9/95- 7/98	\$300,000
Central & Eastern Europe Environmental Economics & Policy Project (C4EP)	Univ.of Warsaw & Krakow consultants HIID, USA	Regional Cooperative Agreement that focused on national environmental policy development.	4/95-9/97	\$1.5 million

2 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

For the purposes of this report, a *program impact assessment* is an *ex-post* activity in which the technical impacts and best practices are summed up across multiple projects. In contrast to a *project evaluation*, technical and managerial aspects are not reviewed and judgements regarding efficiency are not included. Since almost all of the environmental projects have been finalized, our recommendations are limited to those activities that fit within the approved brief of the mission's current strategic objective and its project focused on local management, LGPP. As instructed by the mission, we have sought out best practices worthy of dissemination and publicity by LGPP. Sources for additional project-specific information can be found in the bibliography in Attachment D.

We have used the following definitions: a) *impacts* are broad outcomes resulting from single or multiple project activities and which can be attributed to USAID assistance, b) *best practices* are specific activities, tools or relationships which have been or are about to be replicated by similar entities, particularly for gminas and service providers, and c) *recommendations* include specific suggestions for how to achieve or replicate positive impacts and best practices.

For this report, the term "local government" includes both municipalities (*gminas*) and regions (*voivodships*). Whenever relevant, we have used the more specific term. The relevant body of national government for environment is the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry. The broader term, *institutions*, will be applied to non-governmental organizations, universities, commercial consultant firms, industry, financial

bodies and donors. The term, *service providers*, refers to commercial or non-profit organizations rather than the service provision aspect of local governments.

The team was tasked by the mission to establish a baseline context of the environmental sector prior to 1992. This materials was collected from project literature, background articles and expert and key informant interviews.

We used a four-part framework of impact areas and criteria (Table 2) to guide our open-ended interviews with informants.

Table 2. Criteria Used to Assess Program Impacts

Impacts on Policies	Impacts on Gmina Environmental Management Practices	Impacts on NGOs and For-Profit Service Providers Practices	Impacts on Financial Institutions and Investor Practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Status of national & local environmental policies · Linkages between national & local policy · Changes in level & type of environmental activism via lobbying, critical mass coalitions and collaboration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Adoption & adaptation of tools, models, procedures & technologies · Demo activities replicated · Expanded use of service providers · Finance: changes in packaging skills & funding proposal success rate; funding sources diversified, cost-saving approaches adopted · New civic institutional relationships for environmental management established · Improved citizen/official awareness, attitudes and behavior related to public participation & environmental issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Expansion of staff or skills · Improvements in proposal packaging skills & funding success rates · Funding sources diversified · Cost-saving approaches adopted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Changes in lending procedures of environmental finance institutions (e.g., transparency, efficiency) · Changes in the quality of environmental packages from gminas. · Adoption of environmental criteria by commercial lending institutions or investors

Our criteria for selecting informants were based on: a) balance across the four impact areas above, b) inclusion of representatives from each of the nine projects, c) reaching a range of governmental, non-governmental and private sector representatives, c) including both USAID-assisted and unassisted individuals and institutions, and d) providers and clients. A complete list of our 72 informants can be found in Attachment C.

Due to the time available, travel considerations and timing, we focused the geographic scope of our activities in Southwestern Poland where the majority of USAID funding had

been spent. Only a limited set of activities was scattered in different areas of northern Poland. Assisted gminas were selected so as to include a range in size and number of USAID project activities. We visited five assisted gminas (Krakow, Katowice, Brzeg, Ziebice and Radom). We visited Opole, Gliwice, Lodz and Wroclaw to meet with individuals and institutions from the private sector or Voivodship Office.

The team included an environmental social scientist (Team Leader), two environmental economics and policy specialists (the Environmental and Senior Advisor) and an intern from the USAID/Warsaw Regional Urban Development Office with an international business background (the Associate Advisor). The team leader was an independent consultant with no prior relationship to the projects. The Environment Advisor is an AAAS Science and Diplomacy Fellow with USAID/Washington's Global Environment Center and the Associate Advisor now works for USAID/Warsaw. The Senior Advisor had been the project manager for one of the projects, EAPS, and is now an independent consultant. We were aware of the potential biases presented by agency employment and project involvement and did our best to avoid and counterbalance potential biases.

3 USAID/POLAND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, 1992-1998

USAID environmental programming in Poland has undergone several phases. The first few US-funded activities, prior to 1992, were conducted by other US agencies (Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Energy) in conjunction with USAID's ENI Regional Bureau. When USAID initiated its own limited environmental programs in Poland in 1992, they were regional activities with a Polish component. As per the policy of USAID's ENI Bureau at the time, most country-level activities were managed by Washington-based ENI Bureau staff. The objectives of these early regional programs were to have the greatest positive impact on the environment and, to the greatest degree possible, to reduce environmental threats to human health. Training, technical assistance (TA) and project development services were tools used for these projects. The Agency did not provide funding for construction materials. Projects initiated or conceived during this period include Industrial Pollution Prevention Project, the Capital Development Initiative, the Environmental Training Project and some USEPA activities.

From 1992-1995, the management of USAID environmental assistance in Poland changed and programming became more strategic. USAID/W officers, who were responsible for oversight of regional environmental projects, cooperated closely with project officers from USAID/Poland for more effective day-to-day implementation. Both local and national government, as well as other institutions were targeted for environmental assistance. At the local level, USAID adopted a "demand-driven" approach. Partner municipalities and organizations specified what types of assistance that they were interested in receiving and committed themselves to implementing the projects/action plans prepared by USAID contractors. Beyond the "hard" technical assistance provided to municipalities, USAID's efforts included innovative training in areas directly related to the successful planning and implementation of environmental infrastructure projects, such as financial training, conflict resolution workshops, assistance in packaging financial investments, and public relations

skills. Due to the high level of professional expertise among environmental experts in Poland, these “value-added” elements of USAID's assistance proved to be extremely beneficial to their target audience. Projects initiated during this time included LEM I & II, the EAPS project, the C4EP project and the Environment Health Project.

From 1996-98, the USAID/Poland mission has focused on environmental activities related to the work of local government, particularly gminas. When USAID and the Poland mission reengineered their programs in 1996, environment activities became part of the work of the Strategic Team focusing on improved municipal management by gminas (SO2.3—Local Governance). These activities were managed by the mission-based Regional Urban Development Office (RUDO). Environmental activities have focused on building local capacity to effectively address infrastructure investment gaps and developing solutions to local environmental problems. Projects have combined financing expertise with environmentally-sound technical solutions replicated from other sites in Poland. One important result of these activities has been the leveraging of tens of millions of dollars in local and national financing for investments in municipal infrastructure. In addition to the reformulation of some existing projects, the solid waste management component of the Urban Management Support Project was executed. Currently, the Local Government Partnership Project is underway and its municipal services, economic development and strategic planning should benefit from the collective experience garnered by the 1992-98 environmental programming.

4 ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM IMPACTS, BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 National Policy

4.1.1 Policy - Background

Before 1989, both environmental policy and the policymaking process were dramatically different. Due to political dependence on the Soviet Union and a centrally-planned economy, the energy and industrial sectors were often highly inefficient and generated significant pollution levels due to outdated technology. Hard currency was unavailable for pollution abatement technology. Poland had a basic policy and legal framework for environment during this time but the state-owned industries carried no environmental responsibilities, there was inadequate enforcement, fees for discharge of pollution were symbolic and state subsidies encouraged inefficient and inappropriate use of energy and natural resources. As a result of this systemic inattention to environment, national and regional environmental institutions were quite weak. Because of centralization, there were very weak horizontal linkages of resources and information among similar types of environmental stakeholders and among different types of stakeholders. Linkages tended to be one-way and directive (vertical) between the national and gmina levels. Both national and local government had weak communication and other linkages with citizens, NGOs and other environmental stakeholders.

In the Polish political debates of the 1980s and the historic 1989 “Round Table” discussions, environmental issues became a key theme due to Poland's legacy of acute air and

water degradation. Amelioration of these concerns needed to be reconciled with the huge social and economic reforms associated with the transition to a democratic government and market-based economy. Pollution problems were particularly severe in the Silesia Region in the heavily industrialized southwest region of Poland. A National Environmental Policy (NEP) was adopted by Parliament in 1991 and it included short-term (e.g., high priority health risks from industry), medium-term (e.g., European Union compliance) and long-term goals (sustainable development and economy) until the year 2020. The Policy adopted the concepts of sustainable development and included acts related to energy management, rational water use, wastewater discharge, industrial restructuring and retrofitting and the pricing of natural resources. Immediate attention was given to industrialized regions such as Silesia via investments in coal processing, air quality technology and desulfurization of gases and wastewater treatment plants. Afforestation and public education programs were also launched.

As a result, over the last eight years, Poland has seriously reduced its emissions (SO_2 and NO_x), committed itself to CO_2 reductions of ten percent and limited its production and use of CFCs. A huge program of construction of about 300 wastewater treatment plants will soon be completed. These outcomes were achieved via stricter enforcement of environmental law, increased financing, social support and use of policy tools such as compliance schedules, pricing policies and a close-out program of the most inefficient heavy industry plants. Restructuring of harmful and wasteful processes allowed Poland to be more competitive on the world market and these environmental improvements are essential to integration with the European Union.

Many more horizontal linkages have been created, within and among institutions, since the change to a democratic government. These linkages are used to exchange information and resources. Increasingly, national and local government is providing public information and elected local government are realizing that their success in office depends on public information and citizen involvement. These horizontal linkages appear to be having some influence on the policy-making process (i.e., public rights to information) and have the potential to create critical mass coalition for more inclusive modes of policy dialogue.

Although there have been environmental NGOs in Poland since the 1950s, the 1980s mark the first development phase of Poland's environmental movement. The Polish Ecological Club was founded in Krakow in September 1980. Formed during a time of demonstration and protest, many of the environmental NGOs were established spontaneously, were informal in structure, members had virtually no organizational and negotiating skills and there was little coordination among groups (Czajkowski 1994). As a result of the transition to democracy in 1989, existing environmental NGOs were further catalyzed, new national and local NGOs sprung up and citizen involvement in environmental issues expanded. The Polish Ecological Club (PKE) was actively involved in assisting and monitoring the implementation of National Environmental policy. While many of the local grassroots groups remain informal and supported by both citizens and environmental experts, some of the national NGOs are becoming professionalized. In the last decade, Polish environmental NGOs have increasingly adopted cooperative approaches to collaborate and negotiate with government and others.

Besides correcting the environmental damage from the previous government, Poland's current environmental policies and management are being driven by its desire to become part of the European Union (EU) and the impending 1999 administrative reform at the voivodship and poviats levels. At an estimated cost of \$35 to \$52 million dollars over the next 15 years, Poland must harmonize all of its legislation (approximately 300 environmental acts) to EU laws (Pudlis 1998). These changes may create a bonanza of gmina and national business for service providers that offer training and technical assistance in public awareness. The consolidation of the voivodships (from 48 to 16) and creation of more than 300 poviats between the gmina and voivodship level is also likely to result in the need for more staff training as environmental responsibilities are shifted between levels.

4.1.2 Policy - Impacts

The team applied several criteria to determine policy impacts. These criteria include: the status of national and local environmental policies; linkages between national and local policy; changes in the level and type of environmental activism via lobbying, critical mass coalitions and collaboration.

- *One of the most significant direct impacts on national environmental policy dialogue is related to emissions trading permits.* Based on our discussions with policy informants, it appears that USAID assistance has resulted in placing the notion of emissions trading permits on the national environmental policy agenda. Although this idea had been tested in Chorzow prior to 1995, this experience was not considered to be widely applicable and was not widely discussed by environmental policymakers. A draft proposal of a new act on Environmental Protection was finalized and is now being circulated for expert comments. It foresees emission trading as a new simple, easily measurable mechanism to reduce the costs of compliance with ambient air quality standards and stimulate reductions in pollution. Articles 89 to 91 of the proposed act regulate the use of tradable emission permits. This proposed mechanism was introduced by USAID-supported Polish and American policy advisors working with the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry. A key element in getting this mechanism included in legislation was a catalytic two-day roundtable discussion convened by USAID among Polish, American and European experts (particularly those familiar with EU accession requirements).
- *With USAID assistance from 1993-1996, new stricter emissions standards for first-time registered imported cars (new and used) were developed by the Air Protection Department of the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry, approved by Parliament and introduced.* C4EP staff and working group members prepared requested papers on economic instruments, energy policy and mobile sources of pollution for a joint World Bank/Ministry of Environmental Protection workshop, "Alternative Policy Instruments for the Control of Air Pollution in Poland" in October 1993. The paper on the use of economic instruments in addressing mobile source pollution and reducing emissions was also translated and presented at a Parliament-sponsored conference on Transport vs. Environment. Subsequently, the recommendations in this paper were

incorporated into new emission standards requiring both new and used imported cars, as well as all new domestic cars, to pass stricter emissions tests.

- *On occasion, locally based activities have had national policy outcomes. We found one example in Krakow of how USAID assistance to a gmina has influenced a change in national environmental policy.*
- *Changes in the hazard categorization of nuclear waste, cost-saving options for environmental impact assessments and public procurement procedures have resulted from interactions among USAID-sponsored environmental training participants and with participating policymakers.*

To address its severe air pollution problems, the Municipality of Krakow initiated an urban air monitoring system for collection of real-time data. With USAID assistance, equipment was obtained and technicians were trained. Laboratories were accredited to maintain data quality, first in Krakow and then nation-wide. The new data enabled Krakow officials to prioritize their air pollution problems, obtain external financing packages, improve air quality, develop hazard levels and institutional relationships for smog alerts. Based on the Krakow experience, the Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Forestry amended Article 32 of the Act on Environmental Protection to include specific language which specifies the terms and conditions necessary to announce smog alarms. The Article amendment allows municipalities to utilize data from monitoring system to set minimum pollution levels for smog alarms.

After meeting at an EMTC training course, several participants worked

together to successfully lobby against a proposed legislative change that would re-classify nuclear waste as non-hazardous in order to facilitate cross-Poland transit of these wastes.

After a national policymaker had the opportunity to sit in on an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) training course at EMTC, he incorporated their suggestions for a third and intermediate determination category for the environmental impacts associated with investments. These changes amended the ministerial ordinance on Environmental Impact Assessment. The new intermediate option requires only a diagnostic review to make a further determination of acceptable or unacceptable environmental impacts. It allows interested parties to concentrate on those investments with a more significant negative impact on environment and should result in lower costs and time required for EIAs.

Suggestions on how to improve public procurement laws were provided to Parliament after municipal experts involved in LEM environmental training discussed these issues. These ideas resulted in an amendment of the original law.

- *The graduate students of university professors involved in the C4EP project appeared to benefit from their involvement in developing papers and their exposure to new ideas and policymakers.*
- **Impact Summary.** The team found quite limited impacts on national environmental policy and little was done to broaden the national policy-making process. In part, this outcome can be explained by the low level of USAID environmental investments in national policy activities and institutions. One regionally based, Central and Eastern

Europe Economics and Policy Project was the primary vehicle for national policy assistance and one and a half million dollars was spent over a period of 28 months. National policy tends to be a long-term investment with potential for very significant payoff *once policies are passed*. Our investigation into policy impacts suggests that some of the national policy “seeds” (ideas, tools, mechanisms) planted by advisors were planted too soon to be useful at the time. A number of these ideas are now being discussed again but legislative progress is quite slow. We also learned that there had been a high turnover in Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry staff during the 1992-98 time period. However, it is also important to see these activities as an investment in Poland's next generation of environmental economics and policy advisors.

In Poland, USAID's national environmental policy activities tended to be decoupled from the day-to-day concerns of gminas related to local environmental policy and management. A few other projects worked on local environmental activities which were indirectly related to national policy reformation in several areas (i.e., public procurement, environmental impact assessment, air monitoring) but these national policy impacts appeared to be fortuitous rather than strategically planned outcomes of USAID assistance.

4.1.3 Policy - Best Practices

- *At the national level, the greatest USAID policy impacts appeared to be catalyzed by: 1) activities that fostered either expert dialogue or direct dialogue between policymakers and environmental managers or local officials, and 2) focused on issues that were tied to EU accession.* There is keen interest in the latter topic because it is still unclear to many policymakers and managers how Poland will harmonize its regulations with EU requirements in an expedient manner.
- *Although environmental training is typically viewed by USAID as strictly a means to transmit information and skills, the Polish experience suggests that these trainings provide many participants with a rare opportunity to have an open policy dialogue with other participants from different institutions and environment policymakers.*

4.1.4 Policy - Recommendations

- USAID/Poland, in its remaining time in Poland, has the opportunity to foster policy dialogue, via roundtables, conferences or a series of meetings, on policy issues which directly support good environmental management at the gmina level. *It would be particularly useful to examine the impacts of newly enacted legislation, including EU legislation, on gmina environmental management and identify regulatory gaps and weaknesses.*
- *As part of already planned trainings and meetings for gminas regarding environmental infrastructure, it would be highly beneficial to make policy dialogue (between gminas, poviats, national policy makers and EU accession experts) into an explicit goal of these events.* This dialogue would help participants and policymakers to become familiar with

EU accession standard, requirements and problems related to local environmental infrastructure.

- *If additional funds become available to USAID/Warsaw for national policy work, they should consider supporting groups who are working to open and broaden the environmental policy-making process.* These groups could include environmental policy NGOs and environmental professional associations who are already active in lobbying and promoting dialogue and cooperation among environmental stakeholders. More information is needed to determine which groups are already actively lobbying in this area and who else is interested in doing so.

4.2 Gmina Environmental Management

4.2.1 Gmina Environmental Management - Background

Under the former system of government, gmina officials were elected but represented the interests of the national Communist Party. Technical and financial gmina staff were under the control of the Communist Party. While technical skills related to environmental management were adequate, the financial and managerial skills of gmina staff were quite weak due to the centralized system of government and budget allocation. There were no incentives for local financial efficiency and budget allocations were subject to political influence. In this context, there was only a quite limited role for service providers, either nonprofit or commercial, since large state-owned institutions were responsible for the design of local infrastructure. In addition, all local environmental financing came via the national government.

In 1990, the government of Poland instituted the preliminary stage of a fundamental system of administrative reforms that created a system of self-government and new responsibilities for gminas. Budget responsibilities were decentralized to the gminas and decision-making for local environmental activities (as well as schools) was devolved, subject to national regulation and voivodship enforcement. At the gmina level, this change translated into local authority over environmental infrastructure such as water treatment and solid waste management facilities. Before this change, many of these facilities had been shared by multiple gminas but financed nationally; now, gminas, either individually or in groups, were responsible for financing and maintaining their own environmental infrastructure. The new duties at the gmina level required new technical, managerial and leadership for gmina staff and elected leadership and also new horizontal relationships. As of 1993, gminas were required to compete for funds from the Voivodship Environmental Fund and submit formal proposals with financial and environmental analyses.

Gminas now benefit from many more trained staff and better horizontal linkages but face new issues. Staff have been trained in technical and managerial issues, but election changes have tended to weaken gmina management. During the 1990s, gminas have also had to work out new relationships with new partners such as increasing numbers of local NGOs. Many of these groups have evolved from being oppositional activists to policy partners and sometimes

gmina service providers (e.g., food testing, local park management). However, most local NGOs are still dependent on volunteers and external donors.

At the present time, we found that the most pressing environmental issues for gminas centered around trying to understand the implications of the imminent administrative reform (poviat creation) and how EU accession standards would impact their plans for water and solid waste management infrastructure. Some gminas are already incorporating EU considerations into their decisions about environmental infrastructure but the costs of this cutting-edge equipment can be quite high. Environmental permitting authority, for municipal infrastructure for water and solid waste, will be decentralized to the poviat level as of January 1, 1999. The voivodship and poviat levels plan to divide responsibilities so that the Environmental Department of the voivodship retains responsibility for inspection and enforcement and the poviat takes over the responsibility for permitting of new investments and approving gmina environmental plans. However, the newly elected poviats have had a limited amount of time to organize themselves, and it is already clear that there are insufficient voivodship technical staff to second to the poviat level. It is likely that the permitting and approval will be slower until the poviats get organized and this work may continue to be done by the voivodships' environmental inspectorates for the first few months of 1999. It is still unclear how poviats and gminas will divide up environmental management and how local environmental funding from the VEFs will change as a result of poviats and consolidated voivodships.

Besides additional staff, this administrative reform process will require environmental training for newly elected officials and environmental staff to strengthen their understanding of how to implement environmental regulations and use environmental criteria in local decision-making. This situation could potentially create a high demand for training service providers. In addition, the public will need to be informed and involved in this new division of responsibility for environmental management.

4.2.2 Gmina Environmental Management - Impacts

The team applied a number of criteria to determine if USAID programs have had an impact on gmina environmental management practices. These criteria include: adoption and adaptation of tools, models, procedures and technologies; replication of demonstration activities; expanded use of service providers; improved financial skills (e.g., better packaging skills, success of funding proposals, diversification of funding sources, adoption of cost-saving approaches); new relationships established with other institution, organizations or civic groups for environmental management; and improved citizen/official awareness, attitudes and behavior related to public participation and environmental issues). Our information on gmina-gmina replication is from informants in a sample of four communities receiving a combination of both technical assistance and training (Krakow, Brzeg, Ziebice, Radom). Information on other communities with USAID-trained staff was obtained in Katowice and Wroclaw.

- *One of the most notable examples of cross-gmina learning occurred between Krakow and Katowice in the area of air quality monitoring. Krakow's experience was also adapted at the national level.* After applying USAID-supported tools and procedures for air quality monitoring, the City of Krakow improved its air quality and its capacity to manage air pollution. Krakow then worked with the municipality of neighboring Katowice to replicate this system and they cooperated on joint air monitoring efforts for the Silesia region. Work in Katowice was largely funded by the World Bank. The Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry used the experiences of the Krakow air monitoring system as a model of technology and decision-making processes for the design a national monitoring system. They found that a cheaper system (30 percent lower than Krakow's) could still provide a satisfactory level of data for their needs.
- *Cross-gmina learning appears to be catalyzed by the formation of gmina unions.* These unions can be informal groups, special purpose associations or professionally staffed organizations with multiple objectives.

The five-gmina Brzeg-Olawa union, formed to share a solid waste management landfill, is now attracting other unassisted gminas and working on household waste segregation. The new gminas are within the same river basin, share common interests and motivations for addressing environmental problems and want to learn from the association's earlier experiences. Another LEM client, Ziebice, is trying to organize similar cooperation for group landfill.
--
- *Cross-gmina learning has also been facilitated by the presence of a gmina-based center.* The Cooperation Fund, under the Urban Management Support Program, established a public information center at the site of the Zywiec landfill (a non-AID assisted investment). Zywiec is a well-known model for solid waste management so the Cooperation Fund center provides information on solid waste management to those who are visiting the landfill.
- *Cross-gmina replication occurred in pilot communities under the USAID-supported Local Environmental Action Plans (LEAPs).* Work was begun in Radom and replicated in Elk with USEPA assistance. In both communities, there was a positive impact on local environmental policy and budget priorities. Elk has focused on the reclamation of a highly polluted lake. Radom pursued water conservation and management and the collection and use of landfill-generated methane for greenhouse production and sale to the energy grid. Forty additional gminas applied to USEPA to replicate the LEAP experience but funds were limited. Two gminas were selected as second generation LEAP communities and a twinning arrangement has been used to allow two additional neighboring gminas (third generation) to participate as observers in the LEAP process. Although there appears to be potential nationwide interest in the LEAPs, replication is hindered by the lack of a national institutional home to widely disseminate and promote replication.
- *Groups of gminas served by a single USAID-funded service provider replicated each others' best practices in environmental management and learned how to avoid negative experiences.*

- *While gmina representatives did share their experiences during training, these linkages did not seem to result in much replication of environmental management practices after training courses.* There appeared to be few systematic mechanisms in place to foster post-training on-going gmina dialogue and replication of best practices.

Ziebice, a Silesian gmina, received technical assistance on the design and management of wastewater treatment facilities. As a result, gmina staff and leaders have strengthened their technical and managerial capacity. Ziebice now regularly seeks out and exchanges technical advice with other USAID-assisted communities such as Namyslow, neighboring gminas in Poland and its Czech and U.S. sister cities.
- *Without a doubt, the USAID-assisted gminas that we sampled illustrated significant positive changes in their technical expertise to address environmental problems, their internal business practices, and/or the attitudes and behaviors of their decision-makers.*
- *For some gminas, the skills learned for the financing, procurement and management of one environmental activity (e.g., wastewater treatment) were being replicated for other environmental activities (e.g., solid waste management).*

Ziebice is now applying its new business, procurement and conflict resolution skills from its wastewater management experience to new activities in solid waste management and housing administration. Brzeg has applied its new skills and expertise in solid waste management to obtain a European Partnership Program grant for a city-wide waste segregation system. Brzeg's expertise in procurement is now demonstrated not only in the bidding for the landfill, but also for other sectors (public transportation, lighting, etc.) Namyslow first worked with LEM on the application for grants and funds in the wastewater management sector and then secured funding for a solid waste management project without USAID assistance.
- *Trained gmina staff were able to apply new skills learned for environmental management to other areas of gmina management, such as housing and transportation.*
- *After environmental training and technical assistance, some gminas appear to have had significant success in securing financial investment.* Several environmental funds report that they are now receiving greatly improved applications and financial proposals for environmental investments from USAID-assisted gminas. These proposals revealed new competencies in cash flow models for investments. When training courses select individuals who are involved in investment decisions, their gminas more often have greater success in securing external assistance.

According to ETP surveys of their gmina alumni who participate in investment decision-making, more than \$250 million in municipal investment has been raised over five years of the program. In a more specific example from ETP, a city planner from Gliwice started his own private consulting firm after attending several courses. The planner became one of the key negotiators in a multi-million dollar contract signed in 1996 between General Motors and the city, which will employ 2,000 Poles. The planner attributes Gliwice's improved competitiveness and success to the environmental management knowledge and investment proposal skills gained from the ETP courses.

- *The impact of trained gmina staff on gmina environmental management appears to be tied to critical mass—the impact is low if insufficient numbers are trained from a single gmina or if those who are trained lack decision-making powers.* For training alone, the question of dissemination or replication seems to hinge on whether or not a critical mass of people from one institution or gmina is trained. Usually, one person alone cannot make too many changes—unless it is the mayor. Three of the four gminas receiving TA and training showed clear and definitive changes in their practices, as well as replication of those practices. The two gminas that we visited that received training, indicated that they were utilizing the skills acquired during training, but showed no immediate signs of replicating the skills that municipal officials had acquired through the courses.
- *For most gminas, the greatest impacts on their technical and managerial capacity were achieved via a combination of both training and technical assistance rather than training alone.* Influenced by USAID assistance, the gminas receiving both training and technical assistance appear to have learned how to be extremely proactive and successful in seeking and attracting further assistance (financial, managerial, and/or environmental) to replicate better environmental (and other sectoral) management. In some cases, they continued to use the assistance of consultants or other service providers, even if it meant incurring costs (e.g., for training). In other cases, they used their contacts with other gminas, established through gmina associations or through consultants, to learn about the experiences of others.
- *Within assisted gminas, USAID assistance has had a very positive impact on horizontal linkages between gmina staff from different departments and between gmina staff and community institutions and groups.* During the course of technical assistance and/or training, it appears that representatives of different units or institutions were able to meet and work because of shared tasks. These shared tasks and additional financial resources created the incentive to catalyze new horizontal linkages or strengthen weak linkages.
- *In terms of the awareness, attitudes and behavior of government officials and*

The Local Environmental Management (LEM) project provided training and technical assistance over 2000 people who were instrumental in improving service delivery. Participants included mayors and other decision-makers, as well as wastewater treatment plant operators. Officials were trained in business and strategic planning to define local priorities for short- and long-term environmental investment. When projects were chosen in selected gminas, LEM provided the technical assistance needed to solicit funds, select vendors and implement projects.

As a result of synergy between two USAID-funded activities by USEPA and the global Environmental Health Projects, new relationships were established in Krakow between two technical departments of the municipality and voivodship (Environment and Health), multiple departments of a local university and a local physicians's association. Using the new air monitoring system to provide data, this now on-going network set up procedures and institutional arrangements for smog alerts.

Environmental health curriculum and courses are now being offered by Jagiellonian University in Krakow and involve the close cooperation of local government and university experts. As a result of their involvement in the smog alert network and these courses, local professionals have been able to expand their expertise.

other decision-makers related to environmental issues and civic participation in environmental decision-making, USAID programs had the most impacts via environmental training programs and the Local Environmental Action Plans (LEAPs).

- At the gmina level, USAID has only had limited impacts on how gminas work with environmental NGOs and the level or nature of local environmental activism.* In part, this is predictable since activist NGOs were generally a minor client of USAID's environmental programs and community environmental participation was not generally a focus area. USAID's environmental program was not directly aiming at creating the horizontal linkages necessary to mobilize critical mass coalitions for different environmental policies. Although some environmental NGOs were supported via some of USAID's environmental projects (ETP provided training; the USEPA LEAP activity worked with a national Polish NGO and community groups and the UMSP-Cooperation Fund provided small grants to gminas and NGOs). A handful of other environmental NGOs were supported via the mission's DEMNET project. This absence is notable given the increasing number of environmental NGOs forming over the last decade, particularly at the local level.

Several informants observed that USEPA created a “platform for public discussion” that was not previously available in Poland, particularly with respect to EIA training, comparative risk assessments and the LEAPs. In particular, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) training served as a means to introduce the issue of civic participation to local government leaders. Some training courses were also offered on Public Information/Relations and Conflict Resolution.

Over a period of 2.5 years, the LEAP activities in Radom and Elk enabled citizens and local municipal officials to work together. This experience led to much broader civic engagement, a change in attitude by local leaders about the role of citizens in local environmental decision-making and priority setting.
- Most of the impacts of USAID-supported programs for school-based environmental education and community-based environmental media campaigns (e.g., LEM, UMSP, USEPA) on gmina environmental management were not systematically tracked or well-documented.* There were only a limited number of activities supported in the area. LEM has developed and copublished environmental education materials for primary school children with some local gminas. School-based water clubs, supported under LEM and USEPA-REEC are now monitoring water pollution. In Plock, USEPA funds supported environmental education programs for school children, scouts and youth groups. These programs were replicated by neighboring gminas and twelve other gminas. These activities received a 1996 grant from the National Fund to support new curricula and replication.
- As a result of USAID assistance, cooperation and replication have sometimes extended beyond gminas and the local level.* The Polish-Czech cooperation established by Project Silesia was said to “build bridges of understanding,” particularly on Odra River pollution alerts. Technical staff on both sides of the border are now in daily contact. New techniques in biosolids reclamation of mine tailings were transferred back to the United States after being adapted in Poland. American and Polish sister cities and others are now sharing their experiences related to wastewater technologies.

- **Impact Summary.** USAID has had a significant impact on gmina environmental management practices for our sample of assisted gminas. There have been many positive changes in their technical expertise, internal business management and attitudes and behaviors related to environmental management. Assisted gminas are now replicating new skills from one type of environmental project to other environmental projects and applying these skills to other sectors of gmina management. Assisted gminas are improving their success rate at packaging successful proposals for external funds. Training, in combination with technical assistance seemed to have the most consistent positive impacts on gmina practices; for training alone, results are heavily dependent on leadership and critical mass. Within assisted gminas, USAID assistance has forged new horizontal linkages across gmina departments and between gmina staff and the broader community. USAID training in EIA and LEAP activities have succeeded in changing the attitudes of some municipal officials toward broader participation in environmental decision-making. Assistance to environmental NGOs and for environmental education and communication was minimal but seemed to have had some positive impacts of municipal-civic relations.

USAID succeeded when it systematically sought to achieve replication via new or existing groups of gminas (e.g., using a single service provider for a group of gminas, working with gminas already interested in forming a gmina union, sequenced pilot activities to different communities, establishing a public information center at an already-known and frequently visited demonstration site). Apart from the Katowice and national adaptation of Krakow's air monitoring system, replication appeared much less reliable when projects set up demonstration activities in single communities. Replication among gminas appears to be facilitated by project activities which allow gmina representatives to meet regularly and foster linkages over time. While gmina-gmina replication within Poland is of greatest interest, there were also examples of Polish-Czech and Polish-U.S. replication and cooperation as a result of on-going sister city relationships and a transboundary project.

4.2.3 Gmina Environmental Management - Best Practices

- *When one service provider is hired to serve multiple gminas in a region, these gminas appear to learn from each other and replicate best practices of environmental management.* The experience of LEM and UMSP in this area have relevance to current activities under LGPP. These gminas were able to meet in different trainings and workshops and establish stronger relationships over time. As a result of personal and collegial relationships over time, good management ideas no longer come to be associated with a particular political party or individual. In addition, the single service provider acted as a conduit for information across gminas and encouraged communication and replication.
- *Gmina associations, either member-run or professionally staffed, appear to be critical links for gmina replication in the area of environmental infrastructure.* Timely and relevant training and assistance from a USAID-supported service provider enabled five gminas between Brzeg and Olawa in Silesia to organize themselves into a gmina association for the purposes of initiating, financing and implementing a new shared

landfill. The landfill-site community received reasonable concessions from the other four gminas and cost was only increased by 20 percent. The success of this cooperation is attracting other gminas. The stability and institutional memory of these organizations can transcend election-related changes. Gmina associations are a possible model for how gmina collaboration might be achieved under the new poviat structure in the future.

- *Because of the health impacts of environmental issues (air, water/river basins, waste), they provide an important basis for cooperation between gminas and their regional funders, among groups of gminas and among different stakeholders within gminas.* The Wroclaw Voivodship Environmental Fund was motivated to protecting their sources of drinking water and support wastewater treatment in another voivodship community, Ziebice, that is located on their river basin. Reducing smog and alerting vulnerable citizens to hazardous levels motivated the municipality of Krakow to work with Jagiellonian University staff and a local physicians association to structure a smog alert system. The need to affordable monitor water and air pollution motivated the Ziebice City Council to pay for monitoring chemicals to be used by student water monitors.
- *Support to environmental NGOs, as catalysts or service providers, is an important element of, and adjunct to other activities for strengthening gmina environmental management.* Local governments have often either ignored NGOs or found themselves in confrontational, adversarial situations. However, some local NGOs are now interested in working more closely with local government to achieve common objectives. With new pressures for citizen participation and information, it is likely to be in the best interests of gminas to explore new types of institutional relationships with grassroots environmental NGOs. Strengthened NGOs can also help to build critical mass and popular support for difficult but environmentally appropriate gmina decisions.
- *Environmental training and technical assistance, particularly in participatory planning tools, provide much-needed opportunities to teach gmina officials and others about the value of early and broad-based public participation.*

Through its “Blue Thumb” public awareness campaign in Krakow and other gminas in Poland, REEC has used a variety of innovative approaches to reach its audience, including publishing the Blue Bulletin and hosting a widely attended annual Water Festival. There are now over 140 Blue Thumb clubs in Polish primary schools and more than 4,000 members. These activities will soon to be replicated in L'viv, Ukraine. Blue Thumb members have applied their new skills to activate communities to deal with illegal dumping sites.
In Gliwice, USAID has supported PKE's food monitoring activities to track heavy metal contamination in fruit and vegetables. The NGO also conducted educational and advocacy activities to promote “Ecological Food” (biodynamic).
- *The LEAP replication experience suggests that: 1) cross-gmina learning in replicator gminas is greatly facilitated by using citizen consultants from the demonstration community; 2) affordable replication can be promoted by early twinning of demonstrator and potential replicator gminas.* In the two newest LEAP communities, representatives from two other communities are also attending

LEAP meetings, being trained as LEAP facilitators and learning if this is the right tool for their communities.

4.2.4 Gmina Environmental Management - Recommendations

- *To adequately track the replication of management practices from assisted to unassisted gminas, it would be useful to develop baseline indicators and collect data in both types of communities as early as possible.* It may be helpful to further group the assisted and unassisted communities by size, level and type of assistance, etc.
- *In a short period of time, already-formed gmina associations appear to provide economies of scale and one of the quickest routes for dissemination and replication of best practices.* However, much remains to be learned about how dissemination and replication occur within these associations (e.g., the frequency, level and type of gmina interactions).
- *The new powiat unit may eventually serve as an effective conduit of information and learning across gminas and also create economies of scale.* Whenever possible, these new opportunities should be exploited by LGPP. Besides working through government bodies and apolitical institutions, further information is needed about how the political parties may serve as a potential means to transmit best practices.
- *Beyond technical and managerial topics, serious consideration should be given to training gminas in how to teach other gminas how to replicate positive practices (e.g., publicity, forums, newsletters, etc.).* Training should be conducted in association with formation of alumni clubs and newsletters or in association with technical assistance, or preferably both. Pro-active gmina leaders should be used to teach others about their successes in the area of gmina management. Twinning arrangements can be used among gminas to train gmina staff less formally and encourage replication of innovative practices.
- *Horizontal and vertical linkages, within gmina management and with stakeholders such as NGOs, need to be pursued.* Training and technical assistance will never be sufficient to reach all gmina staff and elected officials. Training different types of representatives from gminas (e.g., government and NGO representatives) together may be a strategic means to create the critical mass needed to change gmina practices.

4.3 Service Providers

4.3.1 Service Providers - Background

Environmental service providers, both NGOs and for-profit consulting firms, have proliferated since the change in government in 1990. These service providers are often managed by former or current university faculty, former government employees and former employees of the large, former state-owned design institutes. For NGO service providers, most of their business is related to training on a cost-only basis. For-profit consulting firms tend to offer a mix of training and technical assistance. Service providers generate business from gminas,

industry and other private sector interests. In some instances, clients have hired service providers to better understand and implement new laws and regulations such as Environmental Impact Assessment. The establishment of the Environmental Fund system required applicants, including gminas, to prepare competitive formal proposals with financial analysis and estimated environmental effects. Most gminas did not, and still do not have the skills to prepare these types of proposals. While initial technical assistance and training services appeared to focus on technical skills, design and software development, many of the service providers have diversified over time and now offer other services related to management (i.e., strategic planning, financial analysis) and social processes (i.e., public information and participation).

4.3.2 Service Providers - Impacts

The team applied several criteria to determine impacts on service provider practices. These impacts include the expansion of staff or skills by service providers, changes in packaging skills and success rate associated with funding proposals, diversification of funding sources and adoption of cost-saving approaches. For service providers, we reviewed USAID impacts on their internal management practices and their client service practices. We looked for evidence of changes in environmental services via the demonstration of newly acquired skills, tools, or practices, leading to other changes such as an expansion in staff, better internal business practices, or improved and more sophisticated service delivery. More importantly, as with gminas, we looked to see if the tool, skill, or practice was replicated to other activities, either within the same entity or transferred to other entities. Gmina clients also provide information on changes in service provider capacity and practices.

ATMOTERM, Ltd., one of three PPCs supported by WEC, attributes its improved technical expertise in pollution prevention and ISO 14000 (environmental management systems or EMS) to USAID support. This expertise helped ATMOTERM to expand its industrial services and staff use Environmental Management Systems concepts to introduce technical assistance in pollution prevention. Its USAID association has been a valuable marketing asset. For ATMOTERM staff, training in better business planning from USAID-supported WEC has been the most valuable part of assistance.

- *For service providers, particularly consulting firms, there has been a rapid improvement in their level of sophistication, business practices and the tools that they are able to offer to clients.* We learned of positive changes in business practices, expansion in staff, diversification of services and a more client-oriented attitude in general (full-service versus provision of only software or technical designs). We learned of an expansion in the market for their services. Consulting firms in our sample appear to be: 1) more competitive due to internal strengthening; 2) more able to see more market potential; and 3) in some cases, capable of changing the type of services they offer in response to market demand for their services.
- *While most of the for-profit consulting firms appear to be thriving and have been able to maximize the positive impacts of USAID assistance, the situation is more uncertain and*

difficult for NGO service providers. The business orientation and skills of the competitively selected for-profit firms

Dynamika, in Gliwice, was one of several subcontractors to the EAPS Project. They report that their firm has been strengthened after receiving EAPS assistance in financial analysis and the preparation of financial packages. This training has had a profound influence on the type of assistance that they provide to clients. Dynamika has now established a brilliant track record for consistently accepted applications for voivodship environmental funding in the energy and heating sector. All fifteen of their client financial packages (gminas, housing cooperatives, utilities) have secured competitive funding. Dynamika has had only limited increase in staff. However, more importantly, they have diversified their services beyond just technical designs and now offer a wider range of customer-driven consulting services to their clients.

LEM, S.C. began as the Polish office of the U.S. contractor implementing the Local Environmental Management Project. During the second phase of the project, they became a private environmental consulting firm and have continued after the project was ended. The number of permanent professionals in the firm has expanded from five to ten people in the last 2.5 years. Rather than continuing to rely on foreign consultants, LEM now has access to eighteen Polish consultants. LEM services have broadened from infrastructure activities to include strategic and financial planning, project management, and public information management. LEM's future plans include on-going training and technical assistance for gminas, a contract with the Municipality of Warsaw for the largest wastewater treatment plant in Poland, privatization training and courses for wastewater treatment plant operators.

have facilitated their growth and enabled them to take advantage of the opportunities that they were given by USAID. Many of the NGO service providers are still donor dependent, and

their progress and sustainability are constrained in several ways: 1) they are legally restricted from making any profit on the service that they offer; 2) they are typically not run by people with a business background or who have familiarity with techniques of market analysis; 3) their financial situation constrains their ability to diversify services in response to market demand or investigate market demand, and 4) as NGOs, they are still seen sometimes as somewhat alien entities and have been viewed with suspicion by some local government officials.

- *There has been mixed success in institutionalizing USAID publications and helping service providers to find ways to sustainably replicate and disseminate information to the public.* In Poland, to date, there is no clear model so for ensuring that valuable publications are updated and reprinted. Publications remained in circulation for different reasons. Some of the project offices became independent entities after USAID funding ended. This strategy

Through USAID assistance, the former government-run Center for Environmental Control and Survey (ObiKS) in Katowice has been able to develop staff expertise in biosolids reclamation and diversify its client services. Ten staff members have become recognized experts in Poland and internationally. The technology mixes biosolids and grass seed with mine tailings and saves 40-50 percent of the cost of traditional reclamation methods that transport soil. Over 40 hectares have been reclaimed, other firms are replicating the technique and more business will be possible once supportive legislation is in place.

ensured that they would at least have an institutional home. LEM, S.C. became an independent consulting firm but also used a strategy of working in cooperation with a non-USAID assisted organization, the Polish Association of Sanitary Engineers, to develop

a wastewater management publication. The guidebook lives on today through the professional association's ownership and commitment to maintenance and distribution. Two other projects, C4EP and EAPS chose not to continue as entities after USAID funding ended. Their guidebook on environmental financing, although widely used and praised, was not developed with a permanent Polish partner and has not yet found an institutional home. There is no potential for a third edition to be printed. The Cooperation Fund's guidebooks on solid waste management were widely distributed and appreciated but they also have not found an institutional home for future editions. In part, the lack of sustainability of some these publications can also be tied to the fact that no USAID funds were made available to advertise or market USAID-supported publications.

It is not immediately obvious which types of institutions have the capabilities, resources and public access to serve as centers or repositories for environmental information. For the WEC-supported Pollution Prevention Centers (PPCs) for industry, two were housed at a university and one at a private firm. By definition, the objective of providing free information seemed counter to the goals of a for-profit firm.

Although universities are widely respected in Poland and can serve as “honest brokers,” their faculty do not always “speak the same language” as the business community, and these institutions often do not have the financial or staff resources to update information and adequately serve the public. ETP developed an on-going relationship with two Silesian universities for the Post-Diploma Studies courses and they were able to serve, to some degree, as information centers for training information.

- *Another area of mixed success for service providers has been their work with gminas on public information and public participation.* Promoting public information, even if one-way public information, is a step in the right direction for local officials raised in an era of secrecy. However, USAID-funded service providers have sometimes conflated and equated the two topics (i.e., seeing public information as the same as public participation) with gmina clients. In addition, they have not always been able convince participants of the benefits of two-way public participation.
- *The bottom line judgement on improvements in service provider practices should come from clients.* For gminas, their attitudes have become much more positive toward service providers over the last six years, and they are requesting follow-up consulting services and attending additional training sessions offered by service providers. This market appears to be increasing.
- *For industry, training and technical assistance by service providers resulted in improvements in their technical capacity, significant client savings and emissions reductions.*
- *Cooperation by USAID-supported service providers has been the exception rather than the rule, within the same project and across projects.* There was excellent cooperation between C4EP and EAPS on the Environmental Finance Guidelines. However, other

service providers, even with the same project, have often been unable to participate or uninterested in cooperative activities (e.g., PPCs, consulting firms, trainers). Cooperation was weak among and between for-profit firms and NGO service providers. There does not appear to be a single organization representing the collective interest of environmental consulting firms or trainers. There are a number of regional networks of

A World Environment Center (WEC) activity established and provided technical training in pollution prevention and waste minimization to three Pollution Prevention Centers (PPCs) in Poland. Through a total of 52 demonstration projects, the PPCs report that they helped Polish industries to implement waste management techniques for an estimated savings of eight million dollars per year and annual reductions in emissions of wastewater (1.53 million tons per year) and other major industrial pollutants.

environmental service providers (PPC, ETP, EMTC, REC, others) but there is often no awareness of other networks or cooperation among them. In the mid-1990s, the United Nations Development Programme tried to publish a guide to donor-supported environmental training but could not generate sufficient interest from training groups.

- *Although the media can play an important role in civic participation on local and national environmental issues, there was little attention to this stakeholder group on the part of trainers and projects.* Other than inviting them to publicity events for publications or activities, there were no activities aimed at these clients.
- *For some service providers, USAID/Poland assistance helped to foster new or stronger professional-to-professional linkages.* In particular, training, scientific fora and publications (e.g., a new journal for environmental health) helped in this area of professional development.
- *USAID assistance helped gminas to work with service providers in selecting environmental technologies. There was less success at bringing American environmental technologies to Poland via US-Poland private joint ventures.* USAID has had a positive impact on educating gminas about how some service providers tie their services to the products of particular vendors because of subsidies paid by the vendors to these firms. These activities were part of institutional capacity building and exposed gminas to procedures that would allow them to use the market to select the most appropriate technologies for their infrastructure needs.

Activities focused on promoting joint ventures between Poland and American environment technology firms and bringing this technology to Poland were not among the main goals of USAID's environmental assistance. In this area, USAID had almost no impact. These joint ventures required mutual interest, adequate finance and institutional capacity and mutual cultural sensitivity (e.g., focusing on finalizing deals versus establishing relationships). For the environment sector, this combination appeared to be uncommon during the time period of USAID support for the Capital Development Initiative.

- **Impacts Summary.** The team found significant and positive USAID impacts upon the practices, for both internal management and client services, of service providers. When

there was interest on the part of local partners, USAID assistance enabled project-created entities to become independent commercial enterprises or non-profit centers. USAID support resulted in a serious boost to the sustainability of the assisted for-profit consulting firms, both pre-existing and new firms. They were able to improve their skills, expand their services and staff, adapt a full-service approach for clients and make to professional linkages. It is still unclear as to whether or not the NGO service providers will be sustainable in the long-term because of their legal restrictions, weakness in business skills, constrained finances and the image problems related to being NGOs. Industrial and gmina clients appear to have more positive attitudes about the capabilities of service providers over the last six years and these markets are expanding as a result of more requests for follow-up services and training.

Some weaknesses or areas of mixed success include institutionalizing publications, selecting appropriate institutions as information centers, training related to public participation and working with the media. Brokering services for Polish-American joint ventures in environmental technology were largely unsuccessful.

4.3.3 Service Providers - Best Practices

- *Technical and managerial training, particularly when tied to technical assistance, has proven to be a powerful way to influence gmina environmental management practices.*

The use of trained participants in future trainings and the replication and dissemination of training curricula are key to training impacts. Interactive and case study training methodologies appear to increase horizontal linkages among participants by encouraging greater dialogue and improving listening skills. Mixing gmina government officials with NGO representatives from the same gmina in training sessions could contribute to improved civic participation. Mixing gminas and business people in management training and using a sliding scale of payment could be one means of subsidizing the low training budgets of gminas. Horizontal linkages associated with training can be cemented with technical assistance and alumni networks. However, unless the decision-makers and technical gmina staff are involved in training, no changes will happen and information can be blocked to those who can most effectively use it.

Optimal pricing of training courses differs between groups of participants. For example, due to the tradition of free education in Poland, gminas desire limited or zero fees for participation. If a fee does exist, the course should be scheduled during the first half of the year to avoid limits on the budget toward the end of the budget cycle. Industries, however, are more apt to pay a training fee.

For NGO service providers, close links between training providers and gmina associations appear to be very productive. Gmina associations can provide membership contacts for easier marketing of training projects (as learned by ETP), as well as become a valuable source of case studies and trainers.

- *Successful strategies for changing gmina perceptions about consulting service providers and allocating gmina funds for staff training include educational efforts by service providers and willingness to work with a client in a staged manner.* To overcome the negative perceptions of gmina staff that consultants will result in higher costs of a project, LEM has published articles on the demonstrated cost savings realized beyond the cost of consultant fees. Dynamika found that when they started with small engagements with the gmina to prove that their firm is capable of quality products, many of their gmina clients requested follow-up services. Combining services in strategic planning with the actual implementation of the strategic plan is a good approach to providing services to gminas.
- *USAID-supported publications must address market demand and be institutionalized at an early stage with Polish institutions if they are to remain in circulations.* LEM's cooperation with the Polish Association of Sanitary Engineers to develop a publication on wastewater management resulted in ownership by the professional association and its commitment to maintain and distribute this publication.
- *It takes business expertise, either with for-profit or NGO service providers, to create sustainable, financially viable operations.* For consulting firms, these skills already exist and just need to be further honed in some instances. In addition, they should be encouraged to develop work opportunities outside of USAID assistance and take advantage of the reputation-enhancing aspect of association with USAID. One NGO service provider, EMTC, received business-related financial advice from its American partner and now is able to pay overhead expenses from the interest from its assets.
- *Three other elements appear critical to the success of service providers: knowing and meeting market demand, diversifying services provided and taking a full-service, client-first orientation.* The private firms interviewed appear to have mastered all three of these elements.

Participants in Environmental Management Training Center (EMTC) courses who were established as trainers through EMTC's train-the-trainer approach, now work in other institutions. For example, the newly established Risk Assessment Center for Eastern Europe (RACE) in Katowice has been strengthened by having EMTC-trained staff who continue to be involved in training related to Environmental Impact Assessment, environmental enforcement, and principles of environmental economics.

The Environmental Training Project (ETP) offered training in two formats: short-term training (2-3 day courses/workshops) and two long-term post diploma studies in the Silesia Region. One PDS at the University of Silesia is for gmina officials and focuses on the restructuring of municipal management systems toward sustainable development. The second PDS, at the Technical University of Silesia, incorporates strategic planning and other tools for industrial representatives. Training tools for both courses have been replicated by, and for other organizations. The Union of Upper Silesian and Northern Moravian Municipalities and gmina members participated in ETP courses. They then provided local case studies in public relations, financial investments, and low stack emissions subjects and were also trainers for future courses.

4.3.4 Service Providers - Recommendations

- *If USAID wants to measure its impact on service providers, then ideally, a pre- and post-market survey and analysis of both the needs of gminas clients and the services offered by gmina consultants needs to be done. This type of survey would highlight the difference between the skills and expertise available and the perceived need for those services. If USAID clarifies that it is not endorsing surveyed service providers, the survey results could be widely distributed to gminas to help them become more aware of the services available and it would also inform service providers of business opportunities. Although we saw a general increase in the quality of consulting firms and an expansion in the market for their services, our impressions are limited by our small sample size. Without pre- and post-market information, it was difficult to determine whether the incentive to change and the resulting positive outcomes would have taken place under ordinary market conditions and without USAID assistance.*
- *Caution should be applied when USAID selects service providers to work with since proposed service costs can often obscure other important criteria. In the area of environmental infrastructure and EIAs, the ability of the firm to provide impartial opinions and objective services may be discolored by outside financial interests. The EAPS project required their Polish subcontractors to relinquish ties to vendors for USAID-supported activities and prevented any conflict of interest within the technical design phase.*
- *Linkages with gmina unions and poviats should be strengthened as strategies to achieve more rapid and greater impacts on a larger number of gminas. Gminas can learn from other gmina associations about how to establish innovative and strong practices for membership in order to remain sustainable. For example, the Union of Upper Silesia Gminas bases its success on its strong daily relations with members and a regional focus on issues. It uses an innovative membership dues formula (charging 18 Polish grozy per citizen in the member gminas, which can be paid in four installments over the year).*
- *For the dissemination, storage and updating of public information (including training modules) related to local environmental management, USAID should try using a professional association for gmina management and branch resource centers with professional gmina unions. Another option would be Chambers of Commerce or Federations. It is not possible to expect a consulting firm receiving USAID assistance to be responsible for providing public information and remain competitive in the market. Apart from ETP's on-going relationship with two universities for the Post-Diploma Studies courses, the experience with university-based centers has also not worked particularly well for information dissemination. Given the lack of Internet access in many government offices in Poland's gminas, this is probably not a particularly viable information option for most places.*
- *Under its current programs, USAID should help find an institutional home for reproduction and dissemination of two publications: the C4EP/EAPS guidebook on environmental financing and the Cooperation Fund's guidebooks on solid waste management.*

- *For training, several elements appear to be quite important in the Polish setting.* Certification by an outside internationally recognized institution is important incentive for training participants since it improves their marketability. An outside body can also screen the technical quality of the curricula. The use of Polish case studies is an important but often missing elements in training and this deficit is seen by many as an indication of that many Americans do not understand Polish conditions. Gmina staff training must be approved by the city council and therefore, gmina staff and elected city councils must be shown the value of staff education so that they will set aside funds for professional development. Training courses, for some types of training (e.g., EIA, public participation) should include a participant mix derived from government and NGO sectors. Dialogue among stakeholders, such as decision-makers and industry, can be encouraged and maximized if representatives are grouped together for training. Other valuable links can be established afterwards, such as groups of alumni. These are sources of participant-to-participant contacts as well as potential trainers for future courses. This may also be a solution for cost sharing, given that some participants (industry for example) tend to be more amenable to paying for courses.

The timing of a training session is important in ensuring participation. ETP learned that the desirable timing of training sessions varied among participant groups. For example, municipal government participants preferred Friday and Saturday courses, while industrial representatives preferred Tuesday/Wednesday schedules.

The distinction between one-way public information and two-way public participation needs to be part and parcel of a wide array of gmina-level trainings in the future. Training and technical assistance is needed to clarify this distinction and promote early public involvement and transparent processes. This information can be integrated into other environmental training and is particularly needed for the new poviat leaders, as well as gmina leaders.

- *If USAID works with NGO service providers in the future, this assistance should be tied to the hiring of a business (management and development) staff person or the use of business consultants by the NGO.*
- *If more regional funds become available, USAID should consider support to those who are interested in forming professional associations for environmental consultants and trainers.* These associations could promote professional development/continuing education and certification. They could track legislative changes for members and serve as an effective advocacy group at the national level.

4.4 Financial Institutions and Investors

4.4.1 Financial Institutions - Background

Overall environmental expenditures in Poland have increased considerably since the early 1980s. In the early 1980s, environmental investment was 0.2 percent of Gross Domestic

Product (GDP); in 1990, the level was 0.8 percent; in 1992, it was 1.3 percent and 1.5 percent in recent years (OECD). Top expenditures are for water pollution, air pollution, waste management, and soil protection. Most of the revenue for environmental expenditures in Poland comes from internal sources. For example, in 1992, only four percent of environmental investment came from foreign aid (OECD) and over the 1992-98 period, the total foreign assistance package offered to Poland accounted for up to just 11 percent of country's environmental expenditures. At the initiative of the United States Government, up to ten percent of Poland's external debt was forgiven in order to increase environmental financing and create the ECOFUND Foundation. Foreign assistance for the environment comes from the U.S., individual European countries and the EU.

Poland has been very successful in raising its own revenue for environmental protection. Most of the financing has come from an Environmental Fund System, the ECOFUND Foundation and the Environmental Protection Bank (BOS). Table 3 below shows the sources of both private and public environmental investments.

Table 3. Annual Sources of Private and Public Environmental Funding (percent)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996 ²
Environmental funds	40	58	47	41	40	34
Bank credit and own financial means of investors	30	20	25	31	32	42
State budget	5	5	7	5	5	5
Municipalities and gminas budgets	20	13	16	19	18	8
Foundations and foreign assistance	5	4	5	4	5	11

Source: Sources of Financing Environmental Investments in Poland, 1998.

Although Table 3 indicates that bank credit is playing an increasing role in environmental funding, it is a significant source of environmental funding for *private* projects with adequate financial returns rather than for gmina environmental management. In comparison with other sectors of economy, the environmental sector and environmental projects are usually less profitable for banks and investors. In addition, commercial lenders do not incorporate environmental impact assessment into their lending procedures. Environmental investments by private investors help them meet pollution standards or avoid environmental fees and fines. There are also investments in energy sector which provide both economic and environmental benefits. As yet, municipal environmental services and utilities are not of interest to private investors in Poland due to prices controls and subsidies and the low ability of citizens to pay

²Figures from 1996 are estimated by the Central Statistical Office (GUS). It is important to note that accounting methods were changed in 1996 to more accurately reflect what has been the actual funding share over time, particularly for foundations and foreign assistance. Hence, it would not be correct to assume that funding from foundations and foreign assistance more than doubled from 1995 to 1996. Given the large minimum size of loans from foreign lenders (\$500,000), these funds are generally available only to big cities and metropolitan areas, rather than medium and small municipalities.

for services. Also, for gminas, municipal bonds, as introduced by USAID, have not yet played an important role in financing environmental infrastructure financing.

Concessional financing has been vital to proceed with environmental investments. These arrangements involve cooperation between public and private funds for environmental protection. The most common relationship involves banks opening credit lines for a particular environmental investor. The Voivodship or National Environmental Funds may deposit a specified amount of money in a commercial bank so that soft loans can be offered. The bank offers credit until the money is fully used and it uses a preferential interest rate. Banks may also use their own resources to offer soft loans if there is an agreement with the sponsor who will be eager to buy a certain interest of the bank. Eleven banks used an interest subsidy scheme to open 30 credit lines for financing environmental project proposals in 1997; in 1996, only 26 credit lines were opened.

For gminas, the Environmental Funds are still the primary source of environmental funds for infrastructure, environmental education and training and nature protection (according to gminas surveyed by a 1998 EAPS survey of gmina users of its Guidelines for Environmental Finance). In 1993, the Government of Poland established a three-part autonomous system of Environmental Funds (voivodship, municipality/gmina and national) through an Amendment of Environmental Protection Act. National and Voivodship Environmental Funds (VEFs) are legal entities supervised by a Board and run by management and a representative of National Fund sits on the Board of each Voivodship Fund. The Voivodship Environmental Office is responsible for imposing and collecting fees from users of environmental resources and those who discharge pollution. The legislation authorized that the environmental pollution fines collected by a voivodship would be divided approximately as follows: 54 percent to the VEF, 36 percent to the National Environmental Fund and the remaining ten percent was divided by the VEF amongst the gminas in the voivodship. These local Gmina Environmental Funds are managed by the local gmina council.

4.4.2 Financial Institutions - Impacts

Based on the information above, the team focused on the following financial institutions: VEFs (Krakow, Katowice, Wroclaw), BOS and ECOFUND. We used two criteria to assess impacts: changes in lending procedures of environmental finance institutions (e.g., transparency, efficiency) and changes in the quality of environmental packages from gminas.

- *For financial institutions, USAID had the greatest impact on the VEFs. USAID has not provided financial assistance to the ECOFUND and has not influenced its financial practices. Apart from staff training, USAID appears to have had no impact on BOS' financial practices.*
- *As a result of USAID assistance, a number of the VEFs and the National Environmental Funds are now using much more sophisticated and transparent procedures for appraising and selecting environmental proposals from gminas. These procedures have reduced*

political pressures on some of the VEFs and provide a mechanism to measure efficiency, effectiveness and donor impact.

Hands-on technical advice and tailored software from the EAPS Project to the Krakow VEF led to new systematic project appraisal procedures for proposals and adaptation of the software in two other VEFs (Bielsko Biala, Gorzow Wielkopolski). In another instance, six funds cooperated and cofunded the development of software for cash flow management for applicant proposals (Krakow, Wroclaw, Katowice, Lublin, Lodz, Bielsko-Biala). Six VEFs plus the National Environmental Fund are now using a similar database to assess the environmental effects of projects that are implemented with their support (National Fund, Krakow, Katowice, Lodz, Lublin, Bielsko Biala, Szczecin). These activities have led to more learning and replication among the Voivodship Environmental Funds.

- *These changes in the rigor of the practices of the VEFs appear to have a direct impact on the quality of gmina environmental proposals.* The interviewed representatives of three VEFs reported that there had been a significant improvement in the quality of gmina environmental proposals. They attribute this improvement to their more demanding procedures. These requirements have also led to increased demand for packaging services and financial analysis by the gminas.
- *As a result of technical assistance and/or training related to financial packaging, gminas and industry succeeded in leveraging significant funding from financial institutions. EAPS, ETP, EMTC, LEM and the WEC-PPCs were involved in these activities. In one example, gminas involved with the EAPS Project leveraged more than two million dollars from financial institutions. Proposals for another 17.4 million dollars worth of investments have been completed and submitted to funding institutions.* These activities reflect a serious interest and need on the part of gminas for assistance in proposal packaging.
- *USAID environmental activities to support communities along a river basin provided the opportunity for cofinancing and cooperation between two VEFs.*
- **Impacts Summary.** From 1993 to 1998, the VEFs and National Environmental Fund have been the most important financial institutions for environmental assistance to gminas. USAID has played a key role in improving the transparency and efficiency of the practices of a number of these funds and subsequently, reducing political pressures for favoritism. As a result of clearer and more rigorous fund procedures, gminas proposals have improved and gminas have sought out help from service providers. These proposal packaging skills have been critical in leveraging millions of dollars of gmina environmental funding and are still needed by many gminas. USAID assistance, in solid waste and wastewater management,

Two or more Voivodship Environmental Departments and two or more VEFs have cooperated on environmental activities. For the Brzeg-Olawa landfill, there was cooperation between Katowice and Opole VEFs. Ziebice organized funding from Wroclaw and Opole VEFs for their wastewater treatment plant. Study tours also helped to convince local officials and funders that these were worthwhile opportunities for cofunding.

to communities along a river basin has also led to unique and creative opportunities for cofunding by more than one VEF.

4.4.3 Financial Institutions - Best Practices

- *The “buy-in” model used by EAPS to cofinance tools developed for, and with the VEFs has relevance for cooperation among gminas and among financial institutions.* The EAPS project provided 90 percent of the funding to develop software to analyze cash flow and a method to estimate environmental effects of proposals. Six VEFs plus the National Environmental Fund provided a combined contribution of ten percent to install the software and receive follow-up help to adapt it to their system. The Funds helped to prepare the original terms of reference for the development of the tools and chaired the advisory committee for the development of the tools. All of the Funds involved continue to use this tool. In contrast, tools developed without cofinancing and early cooperation were only used by a few VEFs (e.g., the appraisal methods now used by Krakow, Bielsko Biala and Gorzow Wielkopolski).
- *Health-based incentives provide a natural basis for environmental collaboration and cofunding.* Wastewater treatment plants in Ziebice and Swieta Katarzyna were cofunded by the Wroclaw Environmental Fund, even though they are located in another voivodship, in order to improve the quality of Olawa river drinking water to the city of Wroclaw. This river basin approach to planning environmental investments also influenced cofinancing of the five-community Brzeg-Olawa landfill on the Opole-Wroclaw voivodship boundary.

4.4.4 Financial Institutions - Recommendations

- *As part of current efforts related to environmental infrastructure, USAID should consider supporting seminars, conferences or roundtables on how to diversify sources of funding for gmina environmental infrastructure, including cofinancing arrangements by VEFs and poviats, and how river basins can be used as an organizing framework to stimulate cofunding.*
- *Future tools developed for gminas should use the collaborative “buy-in” model used by EAPS for tool development.* Financial tools, in particular, seem to require early “buy-in.”
- *As the competition increases for resources from the Environmental Funds, proposal packaging skills will be in demand. USAID should continue to support training in this area as well as educating gminas about the services offered by service providers.*

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Environmental activities were some of the first activities of USAID/Warsaw when it began work in Poland in 1992. Approximately \$27 million dollars were spent over the next six years on a variety of approaches to environmental management, policymaking and finance. In 1996, the mission reoriented its strategic focus to concentrate on gmina management,

initiated the LGPP and closed down most of the environmental projects. This environmental program impact assessment was intended to identify overall program impacts and best practices relevant to gmina management.

By using available regional and global environmental projects, as well as inter-agency agreements, and trying many types of project modalities, the Poland mission was able to learn over six years about which activities appear to work best under certain conditions in Poland. While there were both overlaps and some outlying projects, USAID assistance did achieve positive impacts and some replication.

Our findings suggest that the most significant impacts of these programs appear to be related to strengthening of service providers, expanded gmina use of service providers and better environmental management by individual gminas. Gminas, VEFs, for-profit and NGO service providers are institutionalizing new skills in modern management, strategic planning, fundraising and proposal packaging and marketing. In 1998, many more gminas have staff and officials trained in environmental issues and management.

With respect to financial institutions and investors, USAID had a positive impact on the efficiency and transparency of a number of VEFs and to a lesser extent, the National Environmental Fund. As a result of technical assistance and training, client gminas and others have packaged successful funding proposals and diversified funding for environmental projects. Financial savings have resulted from improved technical review and procurement procedures for vendor/consultant proposals. The funds of the VEFs are being used more efficiently and achieving environmental objectives in Krakow and Katowice as a result of USAID-supported software and procedures. Other financial institutions and investors are not yet significant actors for gmina environmental finance.

Although limited positive policy/legal impacts were achieved by USAID's environmental activities, team heard repeatedly that some of these "seeds" had been planted too early or had fallen on infertile soil. Some of these "seeds" are only now sprouting—several years after their planting while other policies appear to be stalled indefinitely. Some of these difficulties appear to have resulted from frequent shifts in policy-makers and ministry staff during the last six years. Although not an intended impact, the national policy activities did positively impact Poland's next generation of environmental economics and policy advisors by working with university consultants and providing new opportunities and ideas. In addition, some USAID-influenced local actors and institutions had a positive although unplanned influence on national policy. While the upcoming EU accession activities may speed up national policy reforms originally initiated by USAID activities, policy implementation at the local level is likely to be delayed at the local level due to impending administrative reform of January 1, 1999. Both events are likely to require further technical assistance and training for gmina and powiat staff.

In terms of replication, the results were mixed. Without systematic and direct information from unassisted gminas, a definitive judgement cannot be made about the full extent or types of gmina replication between assisted and unassisted gminas. We did note quite a bit of inter-

gmina learning and replication among gmina groups served by a single service provider, among gminas in unions, among gminas involved in sequenced pilot activities and twinning arrangements. In general, expensive demonstration activities in single gminas did not appear to stimulate much gmina replication. For service providers, both for-profits and NGOs, the incentives were weak for cooperation, learning or replication. For the VEFs, early “buy-in” by multiple VEFs appeared to result in more widespread and sustainable adoption of new tools. In general, the incentives for replication included mechanisms for on-going dialogue and shared experiences (e.g., training, LEAPs), shared interests or concerns (e.g., solid waste management, protection of drinking water, air quality, legislative changes, EU legal reforms), shared tools (e.g., VEF software) and shared tasks (e.g., regional economic development).

For the nine programs that we assessed, the team did not note any negative impacts *per se*, only programmatic weaknesses and gaps. The weakest areas of the environmental program were: poor linkages between national policy work and local environmental management; weak linkages between actors at the national and gmina level and between gminas and financial institutions. NGO service providers are still fairly weak with respect to financial sustainability and business-related skills. At the gmina and national level, environmental NGOs could have used more funds to create more pressure for better gmina environmental management and civic participation. For gminas, it will be important to build a critical mass of trained staff and elected officials to cement institutional changes, despite election outcomes.

However, if one looks across the actors and institutions described above, it is quite obvious that the USAID environmental program made a very significant and important impact on the development of horizontal linkages among people and institutions who never shared information or resources in the past. Almost all of our informants noted these much-appreciated linkages and opportunities to overcome the legacy of secrecy and centralization that characterized the former Communist government. In contrast to the early 1990s, there are many more horizontal relationships, in which information, resources and decision-making are decentralized within institutions, and shared across institutions and with the public.

Training and shared technical assistance catalyzed some of these interactions. Other interactive processes of note include the LEAPs, technology development for biosolids, city-wide air monitoring systems and the Blue Thumb clubs. The small grants program facilitated new linkages within gminas. The river basin and health concerns are other means to catalyze broad-based civic and financial support for local environmental problems.

Many kinds of diverse horizontal linkages have been and continue to be forming at the local and regional levels. These linkages partnerships, networks and associations between gminas and also among gminas and NGOs, citizens, utilities, VEFs, etc. Further work is still needed to change government attitudes about the value of genuine civic participation, teach practical methods for encouraging local and national participation and improve local government-NGO relations. For the foreseeable future, support will be needed in Poland to continue building skills and strengthening horizontal linkages among environmental stakeholders.

In sum, USAID's early and on-going support to improving skills, changing attitudes and creating many more horizontal linkages came at an important time in Poland and has helped to build the critical mass needed for better environmental management.

ATTACHMENT A

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPE OF WORK

I. Background

The SEED Act of 1990 has provided the Government of Poland with development assistance to facilitate its transition to a market-based economy and to self-governance at the local level. Improving environmental quality was an important component of this effort and reflects the Agency's goal to support sustainable development. From 1992 to 1998, USAID devoted approximately \$27 million dollars to activities designed to improve environmental quality. They include the:

- Local Environmental Management I and II Programs,
- Industrial Pollution Prevention Program,
- Environmental Training Project,
- Environmental Action Programme Support Project,
- EPA Inter-Agency Agreement,
- Environmental Health Program,
- Capital Development Initiative - Environment,
- Urban Management Support Program/Cooperation Fund, and the
- Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy Program.

Many of these activities will be completed by September 1998. There is general consensus that each program provided valuable technical assistance and training to address specific environmental issues. There is less consensus on the broader impacts this set of activities has had on how Polish institutions and local governments (gminas) continue to address environmental issues over time. For example, did any of these activities directly influence a change in national policy? Have gminas or financial institutions changed the way they do business as a direct result of a USAID-supported activity?

One component of the Environmental Action Program Support (EAPS) illustrates the level of impact sought under this assignment. The EAPS activity created a guidebook to illustrate the financing options available to local governments to secure funds for environmental infrastructure such as a wastewater treatment plant or a sanitary landfill. The program distributed 5,500 copies of this document nationwide. A subsequent survey of 82 communities found that 73 percent of those who responded considered the guidebook “very useful” or “useful.” This is one measure of impact. Another measure involves discussions with a representative sample of these communities to determine how exactly they found this guidebook useful. A third measure of impact involves discussion with regional or national institutions such as the BOS Bank or National Environmental Fund to determine whether they routinely refer their clients to the guidebook as a first step in applying for financing. In effect, was the guidebook “owned” by a Polish institution so that it can be updated and disseminated after the EAPS activity ends?

The institutionalization of tools for more effective, responsive and accountable local government is an important objective of USAID's Local Government Partnership Program

(LGPP). This program directly supports municipal capacity-building activities in 48 gminas, however, its ultimate objective is to have a measurable impact on 2,500 gminas throughout Poland. Understanding the collective impact of Unsaidd environmental activities in Poland may provide a window on how LGPP can more effectively institutionalize a set of municipal management policies and innovative practices, especially financing, into indigenous organizations and private sector firms which, in turn, can pass this information to a larger and broader audience of Polish cities. To the extent appropriate, the Mission seeks to integrate the policies and management tools developed under its portfolio of environmental activities into this process. This scope of work outlines the tasks required to assist the Mission make this determination.

II. Purpose

The purpose of this assignment is two-fold. The first is to assess the impact of USAID's locally focused environmental activities in Poland to determine whether they have contributed directly to changes in:

- national policy,
- gmina environmental management practices,
- NGOs and for-profit consulting firm practices, and
- financial institutions and investor practices.

Impacts should be analyzed within the context of pre-1992 environmental policies or investment trends in Poland relative to those that exist today. Emphasis is to be placed on identifying concrete examples of how a USAID activity influenced attitudes and behavior at both the national and gmina levels and within the private sector.

The second purpose of this assignment is to produce a set of recommendations for integrating successful components of previous environmental activities into the Local Government Partnership Program (LGPP). Such components must complement existing LGPP priorities as identified in the sector workplans and the Cooperative Agreements for each gmina.

III. Tasks

USAID/Warsaw requests the services of an assessment team to perform the following tasks:

1. Establish Baseline Context and Develop Methodology

Prior to departure for Warsaw, the team will review documents from the World Bank, UN European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, USAID and other sources such as locally derived data, as appropriate, to gain a sense of what the environment sector in Poland looked like before USAID began implementing its environmental activities. This component of the analysis will provide the baseline against which impacts will be assessed. The team

also will review program descriptions, workplans, evaluations or other reports for the programs listed above. This information will be provided to the team by the Bureau or Mission. The product of this task will be an assessment methodology in work plan format that establishes pre-1992 context for measuring impacts. The methodology should identify a core list of gminas, NGOs, national and other environmental authorities, private consulting firms, financial institutions and other recipients of training and technical assistance to be interviewed. The Mission-based team member will be responsible for scheduling appointments based on this list prior to the full team's arrival in Poland. In addition, the team should consider the appropriateness of using a standard set of questions or a survey as a component of the methodology. Sample questions include:

- Did the Mission's environment portfolio generate sufficient critical mass to have a measurable impact on environmental policies or practices at the national level?
- Did the Mission's environment portfolio strengthen the capacity of national or sub-national organizations to replicate demonstration projects elsewhere? If so, with whom and to what scale?
- Are there tools for environmental management (e.g., training modules, guidebooks) prepared under a previous environmental activity that should be integrated into LGPP as value added?
- Which of the above programs were most successful from a policy and sustainability (i.e., replication) perspective? Which were least successful and why?
- How effective are gminas and financial institutions at transferring environmental management policy and practices among themselves without direct donor assistance?

2. Scoping Meeting

On arrival in Warsaw, the team will meet with the RUDO director or designee and activity managers to review the SOW, methodology and appointment schedule. The purpose of this meeting is clarify any concerns raised by the team and to confirm Mission's expectations, deliverables and the timeframe for completion of all tasks.

3. Draft Portfolio Impact Assessment and Mission Debriefing

The team will meet with a range of persons and institutions in Poland who are familiar with each program to discuss data for analysis. Contact persons will include but not be limited to: representatives from the Ministry of the Environment, environmental protection boards, mayors, local authority's staff, university professors, non-governmental organizations, financial institutions, municipal associations, private sector environmental firms, recipients of training events and others as identified by the Mission or Bureau.

Based on the review of program documents and meetings with beneficiaries and partners, the team will prepare a draft impact assessment. The primary audience for this document is USAID/Warsaw. Prior to departure, the team will present their findings and a draft report to the Mission. The Mission and Bureau will provide written comments to the team no less than two weeks after the date of the presentation.

4. Washington Debriefing

The team will debrief the ENI and G Bureaus of its findings, as requested.

5. Final Impact Assessment

All comments will be addressed in a final Impact Assessment and submitted to USAID/Warsaw for final distribution. The primary audience for this document is USAID/Warsaw and Washington. Depending on the findings, it may be appropriate to expand distribution to LGPP partner gminas, institutions and the LGPP staff.

IV. Deliverables

The deliverables for this assignment are (1) Context and Methodology, (2) Draft Impact Assessment and (3) Final Impact Assessment. The team is responsible for submitting an original plus three copies of each report both in hard copy and on a diskette in WordPerfect 5.2.

V. Personnel

Team Leader. This position requires a degree in Public Administration, City/Regional Planning, Environmental Law/Policy/Engineering or other related technical expertise plus seven years of international development experience. In addition, the team leader also requires demonstrated experience preparing evaluations of development-assisted programs supported by USAID or other donors. In addition, the leader should have strong writing and presentation skills. Experience in the ENI region is desirable but not required.

Senior Advisor. Requires a degree in Environmental Policy, Engineering or Law; City or Regional Planning or other related area of technical expertise plus five years experience working on environmental policy issues at the local and national levels in Poland. Strong writing and presentation skills are also required.

Environmental Advisor. This position will be filled by Regina Ostergaard-Klem, a AAAS Fellow with the Office of Environment and Urban Programs, Global Bureau, USAID/W. Ms. Ostergaard-Klem holds a Ph. D. in Environmental Economics from Johns Hopkins University and was a Fulbright Scholar in Poland. All costs associated with Dr. Ostergaard-Klem's participation in this assessment will be paid by G/ENV/UP.

Associate Advisor. This position will be filled by Daniel Hall, a PSC with USAID/Warsaw. Mr. Hall has a B.A. degree in International Relations from the College of William and Mary and he is enrolled in an M.B.A. program at Thunderbird, the American Graduate School of Management. Between 1994 and 1996, Mr. Hall worked in Poland as a Peace Corps volunteer. All costs associated with Mr. Hall's participation will be paid by USAID/Warsaw.

VI. Level of Effort

Four persons will constitute the assessment team: a team leader with expertise in impact assessment, a senior advisor familiar with environmental policy and trends in Poland, one environment advisor from USAID Global Environmental Center and one associate advisor from USAID/Warsaw. The level of effort this completing this assignment is detailed below.

Task/Days	Team Leader	Senior Advisor	Env. Advisor	Assoc. Advisor
1 - Methodology	5	5	5	10
2 - Scoping mtg.*	1	1	1	1
3a. Data collection*	14	14	14	20
3b. Prepare draft*	5	5	5	5
4. Warsaw debrief	1	0	1	0
5. Final draft	2	2	2	2
6. Travel to Poland	2	0	2	0
Total	30	27	30	38

* Days in Poland

Attachment: Partner Cities and Public/Private Organizations

The following is a partial listing of partner gminas and organizations that were recipients of technical assistance or training activities under one or more of USAID environmental programs.

Local Environmental Management I (LEM I)

Direct TA: 5 gminas
(Miedzna, Sw. Katarzyna, Ziebice, Namyslow, Nowa Sol)
Supplemental Wastewater TA: 12 gminas on wastewater
Training: 221 participants in 42 gminas

Local Environmental Management II (LEM II)

Direct TA: Olawa, Brzeg, et al. [see LEM II final report]

Cooperation Fund/Urban Management Support Program (1995 - 1998)

Direct TA:	Awarded two contracts to firms to work on SWM with 12 gminas; Strategies prepared for Hel Peninsula SPAG, gmina Malbork, Wolin Island SPAG
TA to other gminas:	Radkow, Ziebice, Starachowice, Namyslow, Lublin, Bisztynek, Odolanow, Piekary Sloskie, Gorlice, Kutno, Oswiecim, Zwiec.
Firms and Associations:	Mikoow Foundation, Dolina Struga (agrobusiness association), Kutno NGO, Impuls Ltd. (backyard wastewater treatment systems), Eco-Kutno 2000 Association, IGPIK, Ekolog, Intereko
Grants awarded for SWM:	Nine NGOs and three firms
Training:	13 persons in conflict resolution, six were trainers
Publications:	Sponsored five publications on SWM
Conference:	Special Purpose Associations and SWM (1996), best practices, 54 participants

EPA Interagency Agreement

Direct TA:	Krakow, Katowice/Upper Silesia, Gdansk, Plock, Warsaw, Radom, Piekary Slarky, Radom, Elk, Chelm, Stalowa Wola, Starogard Gdanski, Tczew
------------	---

Environmental Action Programme Support Project (EAPS)

Direct TA:	Wodzislaw, Knurów, Elk, et al.
------------	--------------------------------

ATTACHMENT B

SCHEDULE

Date	Place	Activity
Nov. 1, Sun.	Warsaw	Rest Day
Nov. 2, Mon.	Warsaw	USAID, Team Meeting
Nov. 3, Tues.	Warsaw	EKOFUND; UNDP; Min. of Env. Protection
November 4, Wed.	Warsaw Krakow	Team Meeting, LGPP Meeting, USAID/ Warsaw staff, Travel to Krakow
Nov. 5, Th.	Krakow	LEM, S.C. Polish Ecological Club Jagellonian University, School of Public Health City of Krakow, Department of Public Health
Nov. 6, Fri.	Krakow	Krakow Voivodship Fund for Env. Protection Krakow Department of Environmental Protection Regional Env. Education Center Krakow University, Dept. of Economics
Nov. 7, Sat.	Krakow	Team Meeting
Nov. 8, Sun.	Krakow, Katowice	Rest Day Travel to Katowice
Nov. 9, Mon.	Katowice	Environmental Training Project Regional Implementation Unit, Ltd. Union of Gminas of Upper Silesia and Northern Moravia
Nov. 10, Tues.	Katowice	Katowice Voivodship Department of Environmental Protection Risk Assessment Center for Central and Eastern Europe Center of Env. Control & Survey CITEC

B-2

Nov. 11, Wed. (Holiday)	Opole Wroclaw	Atmoterm Travel to Wroclaw Team Meeting
Nov. 12, Th.	Brzeg, Ziebice	Brzeg Gmina, Office of Mayor Ziebice Gmina, Office of Mayor
Nov. 13, Fri.	Wroclaw	Wroclaw Voivodship Department of Environmental Protection; Wroclaw Voivodship Environmental Fund Team Meeting
Nov. 14, Sat.	Wroclaw	Team Meeting & Writing
Nov. 15, Sun.	Wroclaw Gliwice	Rest Day Travel to Gliwice
Nov. 16, Mon.	Gliwice Katowice, Warsaw	Dynamika Travel to Katowice & Warsaw
Nov. 17, Tues.	Warsaw	ISD EMTC US Embassy - Commercial Office Sanders Intl-CDI Warsaw University
Nov. 18, Wed.	Warsaw	Team Meeting & Writing, USAID briefing
Nov. 19, Th.	Radom Lodz Warsaw	Radkom, Municipality of Radom PPC, Technical University of Lodz Cooperation Fund
Nov. 20, Fri.	Warsaw	Team Writing, BOS meeting, LGPP meeting
Nov. 21, Sat.	Warsaw	Team Writing
Nov. 22, Sun.	Warsaw	Rest Day
Nov. 23, Mon.	Warsaw	Team Meeting., Mission Debriefing
Nov. 24, Tues.	Warsaw	Finalize Draft Report
Nov. 25, Wed.	Warsaw-WDC	Travel

ATTACHMENT C

CONTACT LIST

Poland Interviews

USAID/Warsaw

Al. Jerozolimskie 56C

00-803 Warszawa

ph. 48-22 630 2480

fax.48-22 630 7486

Rebecca Black, RUDO Director

Scott Dobberstein, Local Government Officer

Andrzej Pęcikiewicz, former Project Specialist (ph. 6434619)

Dr. Nina Majer, Senior Project Specialist, RUDO (nmajer@usaid.gov)

Maryla Jakubowicz, Program Specialist

Local Government Partnership Program, Chemonics Intl.

ul. Łucka 18

00-845 Warszawa

ph.48-22 654 1840

fax.48-22 654 1847

Anton Gardner, Chief of Party

Leo Pastore, Deputy Chief of Party

Daniel Forster, Municipal Services Management (75451.3461@compuserve.com)

Dr. Katarzyna Ostaszewska, Municipal Services Management

(ostaszewska@lgpp.chemonics.net)

Steve Pattle (pattle@compuserve.com)

Malcolm Simpson, Infrastructure Development, Poznan

Krzysztof Chmura

ECOFUND Foundation

Belwederska str. 18A

00-762 Warszawa

ph. 48-22 400950; fax.48-22 400942; em: ekofund@waw.pdi.net

Prof. Maciej Nowicki, President

United Nations Development Programme

Al. Niepodległości 186

00-608 Warszawa

ph. 48-22 825 9245; fax.48-22 825 4958

Przemysław Czajkowski, National Coordinator, Small Grants Program/GEF

(przemek@czajkowski@undp.org)

Matthew Kahane, UNDP Resident Representative and UN Resident Coordinator

(matthew.kahane@undp.org.pl)

Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry

Department of Environmental Policy and European Integration

ul. Wawelska 52/54

00-922 Warszawa

ph. 48-22 825 4784; fax. 48-22 825 8761

Marek Sobiecki, Deputy Director

Eugeniusz Jędrzyk, PHARE Expert (ejedrys@mos.gov.pl; eugenj@nfosigw.gov.pl)

Jerzy Grochmalicki, Advisor to the Minister

LEM S.C.

ul. Grodzka 1

31-006 Kraków

ph. 48-12 423 0855; fax. 48-12 421 8199

Zbigniew Jędrzejewski, Director

Polish Ecological Club (PKE) - National Board

ul. Sławkowska 26A

31-014 Kraków

ph. 48-12 423 2047; fax. 48-12 423 2098; email: tterlecki@most.org.pl

Tomasz Terlecki, Regional Coordinator, CEE Bankwatch Network

Municipality of Kraków

ul. Kasprowicza 29

31-523 Kraków

ph. 48-12 411 7040; fax. 48-12 411 8754

Dr. Andrzej Ryś, Head, Department of Health (rysan@um.krakow.pl)

Marta Malinowska-Cieślak, EHP Coordinator (marta@szp.cm-uj.krakow.pl)

The Regional Environmental Education Center

ul. Sławkowska 12

31-014 Kraków

ph/fax. 48-12 421 6796; email: roee@kki.krakow.pl; website: www.kki.krakow.pl/roee/start.htm

Mirosław Gawenda, Managing Director

Renata Mazur-Gaweda, Project Coordinator

Nick Mariotti, Peace Corps Volunteer

Krakow Voivodship Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management

ul. Garbarska 18

31-131 Kraków

ph. 48-12 422 9490; fax. 48-12 422 9660

Krzysztof Bolek, President

Krakow Voivodship Office, Environmental Protection Department

ul. Basztowa 22

31-156 Kraków

ph. 48-12 622 0441; fax.48-12 622 7208; email: wertz@uwoj.krakow.pl

Jerzy Wertz, Director

Grzegorz Peszko, Economic Advisor

CEC PHARE Program

Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry

ul. Wawelska 52/54

00-922 Warszawa

ph/fax. 48022 825 8628

Environmental Training Project

ul. Sikorskiego 42/2

40-262 Katowice

ph/fax.48-32 519346

Wiesław Chodasewicz, In-Country Coordinator

Regional Implementation Unit

ul. Powstańców Śląskich 41A

40-024 Katowice

ph.48-32 155 3081; fax.48-32 155 1789; email: riu@silesia.top.pl

Jacek Mozdyniewicz, Director

Małgorzata Lenart-Wysocka, Coordinator

Jerzy Zielinski, Coordinator

The Union of Municipalities of Upper Silesia and Northern Moravian

ul. Stelmacha 17

40-058 Katowice

ph.48-32 511021; fax.48-32 510985; email: fmorski@zggsmpm.org.pl

Dr. Ferdynand Morski, Director

Risk Abatement Center for Central and Eastern Europe (RACE)

ul. Kossutha 6

40-833 Katowice

ph.48-32 254 6031; fax.48-32 254 1717

Dr. Piotr S. Poborski, Executive Director (pob@ietu.katowice.pl)

Marek Sowiński, Deputy Director (sow@ietu.katowice.pl)

Michael Drucker, Peace Corps Volunteer

Center of Environmental Control and Survey

ul. Owocowa 8

40-158 Katowice

ph.48-32 599616; fax.48-32597030

Wojciech Stawiany, Director

Dr. Franciszek Pistelok, Deputy Director

Jozef Huc, Head of Data & Research Laboratory II

Voivodship Environmental Protection and Water Management Fund in Katowice

ul. Plebiscytowa 19

40-035 Katowice

ph. 48-32-518-071/5; fax. 510-406

Jerzy Swaton, President

Dr. Wojciech Beblo, Deputy President of Citec S.A.

(former Director, Voivod Environmental Inspectorate)

ul. Duleby 5

40-833 Katowice

ph.48-32 205 3573; fax.48-32 205 3574; email: w.beblo@citec.com.pl

ATMOTERM, Ltd.

ul. Katowicka 35

45-061 Opole

ph/fax.48-77 4544667; email: atmoterm@telbank.pl

Ryszard Pazdan, President (rpazdan@telbank.pl)

Wanda Pazdan, Vice-President & General Manager

Leslaw Adamczyk, Managing Consultant

Municipality of Brzeg

ul. Robotnicza 12

49-300 Brzeg

ph. 48-77 416 3315

fax.48-77 416 4504

Andrzej Baczyński, Mayor of Brzeg

Henryk Wujek, Former Deputy Mayor of Brzeg

Municipality of Ziębice

ul. Przemysłowa 10

57-220 Ziębice

ph/fax. 48-74 191212

Tadeusz Wolski, Mayor of Ziębice

Ryszard Nowak, Former Mayor of Ziębice

Department of Environmental Protection

Voivoda Office

Pl. Powstańców Warszawy 1

50-951 Wrocław

ph. 48-71 441881; fax.48-71 3432028

Stanisław Zięba, Director

Voivodship Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management

ul. Romualda Traugutta 1-7

50-449 Wrocław

ph. 48-71 343 9588; fax.48-71 343 9591

Janusz Stanisławski, President

Polish Ecological Club - City of Gliwice Chapter

ul. Kaszubska 2

44-100 Gliwice

ph/fax. 48-32 231 8591

Barbara Migurska, President

Halina Kacprzak, Deputy President

Misty Hitesman, Peace Corps Volunteer

Dynamika Ltd.

ul. Robotnicza 4a

44-100 Gliwice

Elżbieta Kisiel, Technical Director

Institute of Sustainable Development

ul. Łowicka 31

02-502 Warszawa

ph. 48-22 646 0510

fax.48-22 646 0174

Andrzej Kassenberg, Director

Ewa Borkowska, Program Director

Environmental Management Training Center

ul. Żwirki i Wigury 93

02-089 Warszawa

ph. 658-38-19; ph/fax. 48-22 658 3890

Zbigniew Naklicki, Director

Warsaw Ecological Economics Center
Economics Department, Warsaw University
ul. Długa 44/50
00-241 Warszawa
ph. 48-22 831 3201; fax.48-22 831 2846
Tomasz Żylicz

Radkom Company
ul. Witosza 76
26-600 Radom
ph. 48-48 44218; fax.48-48 44821
Jerzy Gołębiowski, Radkom President & part-owner of Radom-Media, SA
Marian Stani, Radkom Technical Director, LEAP Consultant to UNDP Umbrella Project

Municipality of Radom
ul. Żeromskiego 53
26-600 Radom
ph. 48-48 362 3226; fax.48-48 362 6753
Adam Włodarczyk, Mayor of Radom
Bożena Porczyńska, Press Secretary

Radom Municipal Office
ul Traugutta 30
26-600 Radom
ph. 48-48 362 3354; fax. 48-48 360 0570
Jerzy Frączek, Head of Department of Environmental Protection and Agriculture

Cooperation Fund
ul. Nowy Świat 6/12
00-503 Warszawa
ph. 48-22 661 7175; fax.48-22 622 8551
Bogusław Popis, Program Manager

Bank of Environmental Protection (BOS)
Al. Jana Pawła II
00-950 Warszawa
ph. 48-22 850 8771; fax.48-22 850 8892
Barbara Kozal, Director, Department of Environmental Projects

Pollution Prevention Center - University of Lodz
ul. Stefanowskiego 4/10
90-537 Lodz
ph. 4842-631-3703, fax. 636-5285
Andrzej Donieci, Dr. Sc., Director

Washington, DC, Interviews

USAID, Bureau for Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States

Room 5. 10-008

1300 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20523-5100

ph. 202-712-4133; fax. 202-216-3014

Loren L. Schulze, Chief, Environment and Natural Resource Division

(lschultze@usaid.gov)

Jennifer Karp, Project Officer and CEE Coordinator (Training & NGOs, EPA, Poland/Baltics)

Angela Crooks, Project Officer (Environmental Finance and Investment, Joint Implementation)

Resources for the Future

Center for Risk Management

1616 P Street, NW

Washington, DC 20036

Ruth Greenspan Bell, Director of International Institutional Development

ph. 202-328-5032; fax.:202-939-3460; email: bell@rff.org

World Resources Institute

1709 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20006

Dr. Elena Petkova, Senior Associate and Project Director

Central and Eastern Europe, Institutions and Governance Program

ph. 202-662-2578; fax. 202-638-0036; email: elenap@wri.org

US-EPA

1300 Pennsylvania Ave. NW

Washington, DC 20523-5100

Anna Phillips, ph. 202-564-5419, email: phillips.anna@epa.gov

Jane Metcalfe, ph. 202-6443, email: metcalfe@jane.epa.gov

Environmental Information Systems and Networking

DEVTECH Systems, Inc.

1000 16th Street NW, Suite 810

Washington, DC 20006

Casey Delhotel, ph. 202-739-0116, fax 202-955-7936

ATTACHMENT D

REFERENCES

Central & Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy Project (C4EP)

- USAID. 1998. The C4EP Project: Accomplishments and Impacts (Presentation prepared for USAID/Washington). Washington, DC.
- C4EP. 1998. Measuring the Environmental Transition in Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States. HIID, Cambridge.
- C4EP. 1998. Key Accomplishments and Lessons: The Central and Eastern Europe Environmental Economics and Policy (C4EP) Project. Draft Final Report, November 23, 1998. HIID, Cambridge.

Cooperation Fund

- Cooperation Fund. 1998. The Urban Management Support Program: Goals, Strategies, Achievements, and Lessons Learned, Final Report, September 1995 – July 1998. Warsaw. 63 pages.

Environmental Action Program Support (EAPS)

- Dynamika sp. z o.o. 1998. Environmental Action Program Support for 1996, 1997, 1998. Gliwice, Poland.
- Chemonics International. 1998. Environmental Action Program Support Project, Poland - Final Report. Warsaw.

Environmental Health Project (EHP)

- Ault, S.; Pepper L.; Pollard R.; Rest K. 1997. Summary of EHP Activities under the “Promotion of Private Health Markets” Project Slovakia, Poland and Romania. (Environmental Health Project Activity Report No. 36).
- Malinowska-Cieslik, Marta. no date (nd). Environmental Health Program Development. Jagiellonian University School of Public Health, Krakow.
- Pokorski, J. nd. Sources of Environmental Health Problems in Krakow (Presentation). Krakow. 11 pages.

Environmental Training Project (ETP)

- Barglik, J.; Boryczka, B.; Brzozowska, E. 1997. Analysis of Impacts of American-Polish Post Diploma Studies on Environment-Friendly Restructuring at Polish Non-Ferrous Metals Companies. ETP, Katowice, 1997.
- Butkiewicz, B. 1995. Assessing Impacts of Post-Diploma Studies on Environmentally Friendly Restructuring of the Metallurgical Industry. ETP, Katowice.
- Chodasewicz, W. 1998. Impacts of ETP Training Courses: Environmental Investments in Gminas of Southern Poland (draft). ETP, Katowice.
- ETP. 1995. Foundation for Change: Annual Report for Year Four. Environmental Training Project for Central and Eastern Europe.
- ETP. 1997. Program Implementation Plan for Year Six, Poland. Katowice.

- ETP. 1998. Environmental Training Project Quarterly Report (Activities from October 1, 1997 - December 31, 1997). Katowice.
- ETP. 1998. Environmental Training Project for Central and Eastern Europe: Selected examples of good practice from Poland.
- USAID. nd. The Environmental Training Project: A Model of Sustainability (ENI Newsletter). Washington, DC.

Local Environmental Management (LEM)

- LEM. 1996. LEM I Final Report. Krakow. 21 pages.
- LEM. 1998. LEM Project Annual Meeting (Papers from Annual Meeting, February 24-25, 1998). Krakow.
- LEM. 1994. Lessons Learned and Learning by LEM (Papers prepared for the Prague Conference, January 23-27). Krakow.
- LEM. 1995-1998. LEM II Monthly Reports. Krakow.
- Local Environmental Management Project. 1995. Second Annual Report, LEM Project. Krakow.
- Office of the Town and City of Ziebice. 1998. Report on the State of the Environment in the Town and City of Ziebice. Ziebice.

PKE

- Polish Ecological Club (PKE)/Gliwice. Update on the PKE Gliwice Chapter Tested Food for Silesia Project. Ecological Bulletin, PKE Upper Silesian Branch.
- IFOAM. 1997. Urban Food Security in Poland.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- Environmental Management Training Center (EMTC). 1998. Evaluation Report, 1992-1996. EMTC, Warsaw. 50 pages.
- Institute for Sustainable Communities (ISC). 1997. Polish National Environmental Action Program Pilot Project, Final Report. 29 pages.
- Mazur-Gaweda, Renata. nd. Final Activity Report. Regional Environmental Education Center, Krakow, Poland.
- Piekiewicz, A. 1998. EPA Projects in Poland. USAID/Warsaw (April 1998). 4 pages.
- Phillips, A. 1997. Approved EPA Workplan for Poland (Memo to USAID/Warsaw, March 19, 1997). Washington, DC. 2 pages, 6-page attachment.
1997. Poland Agriculture and Water Quality Protection Project, Final Report (Volume 1: Synthesis Report, July 1997).
- Risk Abatement Center for Central and Eastern Europe (RACE). 1998. RACE News, Sept. 1998. Katowice.
- The Environmental Research and Monitoring Center (OBiKS). 1998. Forty Years of Environment Research and Monitoring Center in Katowice. Katowice. 11 pages.

World Environment Center

World Environment Center (WEC). 1998. WEC July 1998 Activity Report – Poland (Memo to USAID/Warsaw, August 8, 1998). New York.

USAID

USAID. 1995-1997. Activity Reports. USAID/Warsaw.

USAID. 1997. AMR project documents (Environmental projects – Poland). USAID/Warsaw.

USAID. 1993. Status of Projects. Warsaw.

USAID. 1998. Poland, FY 2000 Results, Review, and Resource Request. March 1998. USAID/Warsaw. 65 pages.

USAID. nd. Poland in the Year 2000: USAID Graduation Plan (internal USAID document). USAID/Warsaw.

USAID. 1995. Poland Strategic Objective 2.3, Local Government is Effective, Responsive, and Accountable (internal USAID document). USAID/Warsaw.

Hall, D. 1998. How Municipalities Learn. USAID/Warsaw. 39 pages.

Pecikiewicz, A. 1998. Sector Assessments and Summaries: Environment. USAID/Warsaw. 16 pages.

Pecikiewicz, A. 1998. Sector Assessments and Summaries: Infrastructure Financing. USAID/Warsaw. 12 pages.

Other

Central European Environmental Data Request Facility (CEDAR). 1998. Regulations Containing References to Environmental Protection in Poland. CEDAR Website, <http://www.cedar.univie.ac.at/>.

Chemonics International. 1998. First Draft of LGPP Work Plan, Poland Local Government Partnership Program. LGPP/Warsaw.

ECOFUND. 1998. Five Years 1992 – 1997, Swapping Debt for the Environment: The Polish Ecofund. Agencja Reklamowo-Wydawnicza, Warsaw. 60 pages.

Institute for Sustainable Development. 1997. Frustrated Hopes: Independent Overview of Implementation of Agenda 21 in Poland. Warsaw.

Krakow Voivoidship. 1997. Report on the State of Air Pollution in Krakow in 1997. Krakow.

Markowitz, P. 1995. Trip Report for Polish National Environmental Action Program Pilot Project (September 13-20). Poland.

OECD. 1996. Environmental Performance Review of Poland. OECD, Paris.

Pudlis, E. April 1998. A Dirty Job, But We've Got to Do It. Warsaw Voice, Warsaw.

Regional Environmental Center. 1996. On the Way: the Environmental Movement in Central Europe (Beyond Boundaries: the International Dimensions of Public Participation for the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, Chapter 3). Regional Environmental Center, Budapest.

Szejnwald-Brown, H.; Angel, D.; and Derr, P. 1998. Environmental Reforms in Poland: A Case for Cautious Optimism. *Environment* (January/February). pp. 10-38.

UNDP. 1998. The Changing Role of the State: Poland '97, National Report on Human Development. Warsaw.

The Union of Municipalities of Upper Silesia and Northern Moravia. 1997. Annual Report. Katowice.

ATTACHMENT E

METHODOLOGY

I. Informants

For national policy impacts, we interviewed two former policy advisors (who are university-based) to the USAID-funded C4EP project, policy staff from the Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Forestry and two NGOs involved in policy issues. We also interviewed staff from the Voivod Environmental Inspectorates.

For gmina environmental management practices, we met with gmina-based informants in four gminas that had received USAID technical assistance and training and representatives of two types of gmina associations (a small newly formed member-run gmina union and a large transboundary gmina union with professional staff). We also met with local NGOs (REEC in Krakow; PKE in Gliwice). We focused on attitude and practice impacts. Other interviewed informants for gminas were representatives and financial institutions about changes in gmina environmental practices.

For service providers, we interviewed providers and clients. We met with USAID-assisted NGO and for-profit providers. We also asked assisted gmina clients about their attitudes and behaviors related to the use of service providers.

For financial institutions and investors, we learned from informants that the primary environmental funders for gmina environmental management are the National, Voivod and gmina environmental funds, EKOFUND and donors such as UNDP-GEF and we focused our attention on these informants and their practices.

II. Limitations

The team had a short time to develop a methodology, review and write up the impacts and best practices of the nine environmental projects (plus the nine separate and diverse activities of USEPA). We had fourteen days in Poland for interviews. Another eight days were devoted to writings, briefings, team meetings, local travel, rest days and one mid-week national holiday.

Due to unforeseeable circumstances, the four-person team was reduced to three people for seven of the ten communities visited. Because language translation was often needed and there was no time to hire a suitable interpreter, the remaining three team members chose to work together as a team for interviews. Accordingly, fewer communities and informants were visited .

The methodology and travel plans were finalized once the team met as a group during the first week in Poland. Consequently, few appointments were made prior to the fieldwork. A baseline of the environmental situation in Poland prior to 1992 was not available at the time when field work was initiated. Also, many key project documents such as project papers were not available at the mission or ENI Bureau.

Our field work was coincidentally scheduled at the precise time when newly elected gmina officials were taking over from the former elected officials. This situation reduced the total number of gminas in which we were able to conduct interviews with local leaders. For assisted gminas, we wanted to meet with the outgoing mayors in combination with the new mayors to discuss impacts, best practices and replication. We were able to do so in two gminas. The new mayors were not yet familiar with municipal environmental activities and USAID impacts and neither old or new mayors appeared to be very aware of replication by other gminas. We were not always able to meet with lower-level technical staff who may have more information.

Given the timing, we assumed that information from unassisted gminas would be even less available. With significantly more time to design, administer, analyze and conduct follow-up interviews, a two-part methodology could gather more systematic information on unassisted gminas. First, a mail survey of a random sample of unassisted gminas could be used to identify key informants and possible replication. Unassisted gminas who were replicating innovative USAID-sponsored practices could be identified via a survey to all gmina staff who have participated in USAID environmental training and/or receiving technical assistance. Alternatively, unassisted gminas could be selected at random on the basis of geography (e.g., all gminas falling within a circle of pre-set distance of 50 or 100 km, within a poviat, voivodship, nationally) or by affiliation (e.g., using gmina lists of gmina associations). Second, this survey could then be followed by individual or focus group interviews.

ATTACHMENT F

TRAINING ANALYSIS

Company	Location	Modules	Clients/number trained	Contact
ETP Foundation Environmental Training Program	Katowice	<u>Post Diploma Studies:</u> 1. Survival strategy for industry 2. Restructuring of municipal management <u>Short-Term Courses:</u> -public finance -public procurement -environmental legal system -strategy planning -public relations -land valuation -environmental audits -marketing of environmental goods & services -integrated waste management -Internet -personnel management -advertising & media cooperation -ISO 14000 -quality management -business plan development	Total number of participants: 1611 Business leaders (599) Municipalities/gminas (712) Science Community (86) Public/NGO (171) Others (43)	Wieslaw Chodasewicz President Sikorskiego 42/2 Katowice ph/fax. (032) 519346
LEM S.C. Local Environmental Management	Krakow	<u>Short-Term Courses:</u> -strategic planning -long term planning of infrastructure projects -project financing -project management -budgeting and financial administration -restructuring of municipal services -bidding procedures -human resource management -public relation and public communication -conflict resolution -wastewater management -public outreach	Total number of participants 2273. Municipalities/gminas (986) Business (360) Utilities (621) Science (51) Government (93) Other (162)	Zbigniew Jedrzejewski President Grodzka 1 31-006 Krakow ph. (012) 423 0855 fax. (012) 421 8199
EMTC Environmental Management Training Center	Warsaw	<u>Short-Term Courses:</u> -law enforcement -environmental impact assessment -risk assessment -hazardous waste sites ranking -chemical preparadeness & prevention -environmental economics -environmental policy -environmental audit -fundraising -envtl. investments -contract management -solid waste management -public outreach	About 4000 training participants including: -politicians -local authorities -municipal managers -spatial planners -scientists and experts -rural sector representatives -privatization managers -consultants -educational institutions -NGO, students -central and local media -candidates for trainers	Zbigniew Naklicki Director Environmental Management Training Center ul. Żwirki i Wigury 93 02-089 Warszawa ph. 48-22 658 3819 fax.48-22 658 3890

ATTACHMENT G

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BOS	Bank of Environmental Protection
C4EP	Central and East European Environmental Economics Policy Project
CDI, CDI-E	Capital Development Initiative - Environment
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CF	Cooperation Fund
CFCs	chlorofluorocarbons
CITEC	Center of Environmental Control and Survey
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
DEMNET	Democracy Network
EAPS	Environmental Action Program Support Project
EHP	Environmental Health Project
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMS	Environmental Management System
ENI	Bureau for Europe and the Newly Independent States
EMTC	Environmental Management and Training Center
ETP	Environmental Training Project
EU	European Union
G/ENV/UP	Global Bureau/Center for Environment/Urban Programs Office
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
LEAP	Local Environmental Action Plan
LEM	Local Environmental Management
LGPP	Local Government Partnership Program
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NEP	National Environmental Policy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NO _x	nitrous oxide
OBiKS	Center for Environmental Control and Survey
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PDS	post-diploma studies
PHARE	Poland and Hungary: Assistance in Reconstructing Economies
PKE	Polish Ecological Club
PPC	Pollution Prevention Center
RACE	Risk Abatement Center for Central and Eastern Europe
REC	Regional Environmental Center
REEC	Regional Environmental Education Center
RFF	Resource for the Future
RIU	Regional Implementation Unit
RUDO	Regional Urban Development Office
SEED Act	Support for East European Democracy Act
SOW	Scope of Work
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SO 2.3	Strategic Objective 2.3 (Local Governance)
SPAG	Special Purpose Association of Gminas
TA	technical assistance
UMSP	Urban Management Support Program
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAID/W	United States Agency for International Development/Washington Office

G-3

USEPA, EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
VEI	Voivodship Environmental Inspectorate
WDC	Washington, DC
WEC	World Environmental Center
WFOS/VEF	Voivodship Environmental Fund
WRI	World Resources Institute